

THE  
**CRITICAL REVIEW.**

**SERIES THE THIRD.**

---

**Vol. V. JUNE, 1805. No. II.**

---

**ART. I.—***An Historical Review of the State of Ireland, from the Invasion of that Country under Henry II. to its Union with Great Britain. By Francis Plowden, Esq. 2 Vols. 4to bound in 3. 4l. 4s. Egerton. 1803.*

IT is a fact not a little remarkable, that while the history of Great Britain is known by most men of liberal studies with considerable accuracy, and those of the principal nations in Europe are, at least in their general outlines, very familiar to them, the domestic annals of a country so closely connected with our own as Ireland, have been almost universally overlooked. Our English historians present us indeed from time to time with short and imperfect notices of the state of our neighbours, but even these are only introduced as it were by necessity, to illustrate such transactions in England as are directly related to them, or to display more fully the portrait of some English hero. *Carent quia vate sacro*, is the cause which has covered with oblivion the objects of historic, as well as poetical celebration. But our neglect of Irish history before the Revolution is not excusable on this pretext; the work of Leland, though too prolix in the earlier part, combines with much elegance of style and judiciousness of remark, an undeviating impartiality, rare in the history of every nation, and certainly not least so in that of Ireland. Since the Revolution indeed, the progress of that long political conflict which terminated in the union, has hardly been illuminated by a single ray. In England we still indeed desiderate the candid and discerning historian, who shall select and combine the most important events of our own country during the eighteenth century; but the mass of materials accessible to all, and known to many, has better enabled us to expect in patience the arrival of such a phenomenon. With respect to Ireland, this is not the case; and we naturally hail with pleasure a

**CRIT. REV. Vol. 5. June, 1805.** I

publication, which professes to supply a deficiency of which we have long been sensible.

The appearance of Mr. Plowden's volumes is rather formidable. Imagine to yourself, gentle reader, two quartos, containing respectively 1003 and 1480 pages. The latter indeed, for your greater comfort, is bound up in two parts. Yet we do not mean to insinuate, that Mr. Plowden might not have been less moderate in his demands upon the public studies. We doubt not that he has omitted, exclusive of advertisements, almost as much letter-press of the *Dublin Evening Post* as he has inserted; that many pamphlets, especially on the treasury side, have not been transcribed; and that he might have added, from the stores of his own mind, many thousand reflections, little inferior in importance and profundity to those which at present decorate his annotations. Perhaps indeed

‘Cynthia aurem  
Vellit, et admonuit.’

Mr. Godwin has told us, that the timely interference of Apollo, in the shape of Mr. Phillips, saved the commonwealth from a third volume of the *Life of Chaucer*; and certainly a cold-blooded purchaser of copy-right might tremble at the reams of paper to which Mr. Plowden's manuscript must have extended. In this age of sciolists, learning is not bought by the cubic foot. These ‘three chopping bastards, each as large as an infant Hercules,’ are not guests for the tables of dilettanti; and, upon this account, we think it possible that some individuals may look over our effusions, who will neither purchase nor peruse Mr. Plowden's history.

There is a notion which seems very prevalent among historians, that the importance of facts is inversely as the square, or some higher power, of their distances. Now, in spite of the beautiful analogy between moral and physical laws which this theorem presents, our regard for truth compels us to admit it with some hesitation. Are the wars of the League less interesting than those of the Fronde? Ought the distracted times of Charles the First to fill a less space in history than the corresponding period of the ensuing century, gliding on with an unruffled stream through peace, riches, and tranquillity? Ignorant people indeed always suppose the events of their own age to be vastly more wonderful than any which have gone before, as rustics conceit their own parish-church to be the finest in Christendom; but it is not the duty of an historian to accommodate his plan to prejudices which are wholly incompatible with all philosophical reasoning upon time past. But the rules according to which Mr. Plowden has dilated or condensed his narrative, are beyond all example disproportionate

to the importance of the events recorded. Forty-six pages bring us to the reign of Henry VIII.; one hundred and ninety more to the death of Anne; while the three subsequent reigns occupy the entire remainder of these prodigious volumes. Nor can Mr. Plowden rest upon what he seems (page 1) to intimate, that he writes only the history of the union, and the prominent events leading to it; for, not to mention the title which his book assumes, nine parts out of ten that he has written, are any thing rather than an account of prominent events leading to that memorable transaction.

The preliminary chapter treats of the state of Ireland before its invasion by the English. The prejudices of the Irish on this subject, though we cannot adopt, we shall not treat with disrespect. It is the peculiar fate of Ireland, never to have shone forth among the nations of Europe as an independent power. Scotland, Arragon, Hungary, though now absorbed in larger empires, can trace in unequivocal history the dynasties of their own monarchs, and the deeds which their own sons have achieved. But the authentic annals of Ireland since the invasion of Henry II. are unknown to the rest of mankind, or known only by dreadful epochs of rebellion and massacre. Hence the mind of an Hibernian patriot is led to seek in fabulous antiquity that national importance which later times do not attest; and while it expatiates in the ideal glories of the three sons of Milesius, regards with undisguised contempt the upstart kingdoms of this degenerate age.

The next chapter presents us with a very imperfect and superficial account of the interval between the second and eighth Henries.\* We trust that no vulgar nationality misleads us, when we profess our admiration of the general character and conduct of the English people; when we discover in it a haughty quickness to resent injuries accompanied with an abhorrence of committing them, and a stern courage tempered by a generous clemency. But with regret we add, that the system which she has pursued towards Ireland, shews very little of these noble dispositions. Founded in unjust aggression, her dominion was maintained by a scheme of proceeding,

---

\* We take this opportunity of mentioning, what is not perhaps very generally known, that, so early as the reign of Edgar, the crown of England had obtained, probably a nominal, and certainly a transient, sovereignty over part of Ireland. There is a charter of that prince, A. D. 964, which contains the following words: 'Mihi concessit propitia divinitas cum Anglorum imperio omnia regna insularum Oceani cum suis feraissimis regibus usque Norwegiam, maximamque partem Hibernia cum sua nobilissima ciuitate Dublino, Anglorum regno subjugare.' Seld. Tit. of Hon. p. 55. edit. 1614. It is a tradition of this monarch, that he was rowed in his barge on the river Dee by eight kings, of whom Kenneth king of Scots was one; probably some Irish *reguli* were of the number.

in which folly and tyranny went hand in hand together. The country was parcelled out among a few English adventurers, who speedily became not less barbarous than the natives, whom it was their chief care to exterminate; while their feuds and rebellions prevented every benefit which the policy of government might, from time to time, have communicated to so extensive a portion of the empire. We read with indignation, that in 1278 the Irishry petitioned Edward the First for the free enjoyment of English laws, that their prayer was favourably received by that wise prince, but that so excellent a measure was evaded by the English oligarchy, who had already laid the basis of that *ascendancy* which so long kept the people of Ireland in subjection. We cannot but transcribe the words of sir John Davis, from whose golden little book Mr. Plowden, as well he might, has made frequent extracts: 'As long as they were out of the protection of the lawe, so as every Englishman might oppresse, spoyle, and kill them without controulment, howe was it possible they shoulde bee other than out-lawes and enemies to the crowne of Englande? If the king would not admit them to the condition of subjects, how could they learn to acknowledge and obey him as their sovereigne? When they might not converse or commerce with any civill men, nor enter into any towne or citie without peril of their lives, whither should they flie but into the woods and mountains, and there live in a wild and barbarous manner?' Discoverie of the True Causes, &c. p. 119. Hence neither by conquest or submission, as Davis well shews, had Ireland become fully subject to the English crown, till the vigorous administration of Elizabeth overpowered the last struggle of Irish independance. In this infirm state of things, the Reformation was introduced into Ireland, an event upon which we may be allowed to make one or two observations. If we were to indulge ourselves in reasoning as mere politicians, with respect to religious establishments, it might almost appear, perhaps, a principle of natural justice, that the opinions of the majority, supposing that majority to be indisputable, should point out the sect by whose ministers they are to be instructed, and whose expences they are to defray. But whatever may be thought of the necessity that Protestantism should be established in Ireland, the means by which it was secured were at all events unjustifiable. The authority of lord Clare will pass current with many men upon this question. 'It seems difficult to conceive,' says his lordship, 'any more unjust or impolitic act of government, than an attempt to force new modes of religious faith and worship, by severe penalties, upon a rude, superstitious, and unlettered people. Persecutions or attempts to force conscience will never produce conviction.'



They are calculated only to make hypocrites or martyrs.' Whether from national hatred, gross ignorance, or whatever cause, the new establishment was very ill received in Ireland. It seems indeed a problem (and we beg again to be considered as advancing, and that with hesitation, a mere political speculation, without adverting to the other points of view in which the subject may be placed), whether the anomalous system of the church of England, differing so widely from the catholic church in doctrine, and as materially from the other protestant churches in discipline, though proved by experience to be admirably adapted to the country where it was framed, be equally fitted for any other people. In Scotland, in Ireland, in America, wherever in short the experiment has been tried, it has certainly failed of success; and perhaps the ecclesiastic, like the civil polity of England, possesses a racy flavour of its native soil, which, by nations of different temperament and prejudices, may rather be admired than imitated. Be this as it may, the people of Ireland adhered to the Romish communion, and various penal laws were enacted during the reign of Elizabeth to chastise this refractory difference from their sovereign's creed; which however, like the corresponding statutes in England, neither impaired the rights of property, nor took away from recusants their seats in parliament. Having said thus much against this change of religion, we must in candour state some arguments on the other side. The progress of the reformed religion in Ireland was, upon every political account, greatly to be wished. The title of Elizabeth was openly impugned by the see of Rome; her enemies, Mary of Scotland and Philip of Spain, were the hope and support of the catholic cause; while a host of spiritual adversaries, priests, friars, and jesuits, waged irreconcilable war against her person and authority. We judge sometimes illiberally through our liberality itself; and, justly zealous in the cause of toleration, forget how perilous a conflict every protestant prince in the sixteenth century sustained against the active and rancorous hostility of Rome. The catholics of that age were not peaceable unresisting sectaries, groaning under restraints which wanton fanaticism imposed. They formed, especially the priests, a compact organized body, professedly regardless of political allegiance,\* and often unchecked in the cause of their party by moral obligations.

---

\* A striking instance of this is given by Carte, from Rinuccini's Memoirs, which we shall transcribe for the benefit of those gentlemen who believe that the catholics were at no time dangerous to a protestant sovereign. 'The nuncio, in a speech to the council of Kilkenny in 1645, had recommended fidelity to the king. A copy of this speech he sent to Rome; and in return was severely reprimanded by cardinal Pamilio, for that the holy see never

The fourth chapter of Mr. Plowden's history comprizes the reign of Charles the First; and we are compelled to say, that, whether from an inability to select from the chaos of materials those facts which form the basis of historical narrative, or from an unwillingness to throw a strong light upon transactions unfavourable to his own party, our author has involved this interesting period in so much confusion, that no man previously unacquainted with the circumstances, can derive any connected information from his incoherent rhapsody. There is a fashion of writing history lately grown up, the characteristic of which is, that it rather alludes to events as already known, than relates them as they occurred. Of this vicious style the latter volumes of Gibbon afford numberless instances; and, unlike as Mr. Plowden is to that distinguished writer in every other respect, he bears an unfortunate resemblance to him in this imperfection. Such, however, as this narration is, its avowed drift is to persuade us that the insurrection of 1641 'is to this day most unwarrantably and unjustly called, an odious and unnatural rebellion.' The grounds upon which the author would lead us to such a conclusion, we shall proceed to examine. Let Mr. Plowden speak for himself.

'If the catholics felt themselves aggrieved by the severity of the late lords justices, much more reason had they to complain of the conduct of lord Wentworth who succeeded them. This nobleman, better known under his superior style of the earl of Strafford, continued lord deputy from the year 1633 to the year 1641. As the close of his administration was the opening of what is usually termed the great Irish rebellion, it becomes the duty of the historian to scrutinize it with rigorous impartiality, in order to determine whether an event so closely preceded by a seven years administration of extraordinary austerity, were not fomented, accelerated, aggra-

---

would by any positive act approve the civil allegiance which catholic subjects pay to an heretical prince; and the displeasure of the court of Rome was the greater, as he had deposited a copy of his speech with the council, which if published, would furnish heretics with arguments against the papal authority over heretical princes, when the pope's own minister should exhort catholics to be faithful to such a king.' We trust that no one will accuse us, from this extract, of prepossession against the catholics of the present age. On the contrary, not only the liberal and enlightened sentiments of that body, but the virtual dedication of all temporal power long made by the Vatican (more inclined at present to supplicate assistance from the English government, than to formulate censures against it), prove, that the restraints which still exist, were erected under very different circumstances; and one of our objects in the foregoing extract is, to shew that we cannot plead the authority of our ancestors for denying any political rights to the loyal and liberal professors of the Romish faith. There is a curious document, Vol. II. Appendix No. 91., containing the answers of the universities of Paris, Louvain, Douay, Alcala, Salamanca, and Valladolid, to a case laid before them at the request of Mr. Pitt, touching the temporal authority of the pope. These answers are wholly conformable to common sense, and the liberal spirit of modern times, which, it seems, has pervaded the licenciados of Salamanca.

wated, or occasioned, by that system of severity and terrorism. Upon this more than upon any other point of modern Irish history, are the English and Irish historians at open variance. The former from Temple, Borlase, Cox, Clarendon, and Carte, down to Leland and Warner, all represent the reigns of the two first Stuarts, as the halcyon days of peace, prosperity, and felicity to Ireland. The latter, on the contrary, from lord Castlehaven, the bishop of Ferns, Peter Walsh, down to Gheoghegan, O'Connor, and Currie, consider that rebellion, mainly occasioned and brought forward by the intemperate, cruel, and unconstitutional administration of the earl of Strafford. In this wide difference of opinion, I shall barely refer to the leading circumstances of his administration, leaving the inference to the unbiassed reflection of the impartial reader.'

Notwithstanding this shew of 'leaving the inference to the impartial reader,' Mr. Plowden, as might be expected, prefers Irish evidence to English, that is, catholic to protestant, and paints the administration of lord Strafford in the darkest colours. The conduct of that famous statesman, who added to insolence and tyranny the deeper guilt of apostacy from the cause of patriotism, will not find in us very favourable judges. To assert that Strafford was a constitutional minister, is the greatest of errors, except perhaps that of such as maintain the equity and propriety of his attainder. But a religious insurrection can only be justified by religious persecution; if his administration was not oppressive to the catholics as such, the pretext of religious grievances cannot be supported by proofs of political tyranny. Now, that the catholics of Ireland should have eminently suffered from the rigour of penal laws during the reign of Charles the First, is so contrary to what we know of the policy which his ministers pursued, that, independantly of all direct evidence, we should readily acquit lord Strafford of such intolerance. But Mr. Plowden, with more candour than cunning, admits, that 'when lord Wentworth was appointed deputy, the presentments against recusants were discontinued.' Nor has he adduced a single proof that the catholics endured any molestation during the whole eight years of his government. The authority of lord Clarendon cannot be fairly neglected upon this point. 'Though there were some laws against them still in force,' says the noble historian, 'yet the edge of those laws was so totally rebated by the clemency and compassion of the king, that no man could say he had suffered prejudice or disturbance in or for his religion.' *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars of Ireland*, p. 9. edit. 1720. Of the political grievances sustained by the Irish during lord Strafford's lieutenancy, the chief mentioned by Mr. Plowden, is the finding of the king's title to most of the province of Connaught. Undoubtedly this favourite scheme

of the lord deputy's was a high act of overstrained prerogative, and accompanied with such arbitrary proceedings towards the uncompliant jury of Galway, as might well rouse the indignation of every friend to his country's liberties. But what our author has forgotten to state, we will not omit: that possession was never taken under the royal title; and the storm, after hanging for several years over the heads of the proprietors, was dispersed by a revocation of all the proceedings on the very eve of the rebellion.

The year 1641 was as memorable at Dublin as at Westminster for the triumph of democracy over prerogative. With a versatility of which Irish senates have presented other instances, the same house of commons, who in their last act of subsidies had formally thanked his majesty for placing over them so wise, just, and vigilant a governor as lord Strafford, now as formally retracted the eulogy, and co-operated through the medium of a committee with the English parliament for his destruction. A spirit of redress and reformation was stalking abroad; and whatever wrongs might have been sustained by Ireland, there was every hope of obtaining that relief by law, which should never, but in the last hour of necessity, be sought by rebellion.

At this point Mr. Plowden changes his ground. Patriotism is a good word, and loyalty is another. The Irish catholics, it seems, fought neither for religion nor liberty, but for Charles the First. 'It is impossible,' says Mr. Plowden very truly, 'to fix the day on which the usurped power of the parliamentarians commenced, and the constitutional power of the crown ceased. From the moment of that usurpation, resistance to the parliamentary power was loyalty, not treason.' Delighted with this discovery, Mr. Plowden drops from henceforth lord Strafford and his tyranny, and becomes the unwearied advocate of the royal authority against rebels and regicides. That the latter scheme of justifying the insurrection is not very compatible with the former, most men, we think, will concede. But as we care very little for the consistency of Mr. Plowden's theories, and very much for historical truth, let us consider this latter representation of the objects of the catholics, which is, we believe, generally adopted by persons of that communion. In the first place, the Irish rebellion was an irreparable misfortune to the king's affairs. The detention of those troops which he might otherwise have drawn to his succour, was the smallest part of the evil. Guiltless as Charles undoubtedly was of that unparalleled massacre with which the rebellion commenced, the suspicion sunk deep into the hearts of the English nation. Of all the reproaches which the malignity of his enemies cast upon



him, the sting was the Irish massacre; and the courtiers of Oxford vied with the credulous rabble of London in their apprehensions, as in their abhorrence, of the rebels. Undoubtedly such friendship is not very usual on the east of St. George's Channel; and if the confederates of Kilkenny seriously imagined that they assisted the royal cause by their insurrection, they committed the greatest practical *bull* that the world ever witnessed.

But did they seriously design to act as loyalists? Remark the facts. Was it after the cessation of 1643, when they evaded all the importunities of Ormond to fulfil their promises of assistance? Or was it when they insulted the king at Oxford with demands, by granting which he must have lost all hope of either British crown? Or shall we say, that the rupture of the peace in 1646 evinced an inclination to rescue Charles from the calamities which environed him? We cannot enter into a detail which would be co-extensive with the history of the age. But we send our readers to the impartial narrative of Leland, and request them to judge from notorious public facts, whether this defence of the Irish rebellion be just or sophistical. It seems in truth rather surprising, that with all Mr. Plowden's allegiance to Charles the First, the most faithful followers of that prince, if they were protestants, meet with very little favour. Hear how he traduces that mirror of loyalty and honour, the great duke of Ormond.

‘The marquis of Ormond was a man of personal intrepidity, some military knowledge, and very extensive ambition, imperious, haughty, vindictive and impatient of controul; he was so implacable to the catholics, that in his hatred to them he not only contravened the commands and wishes of his royal master, but basely descended to execute the sanguinary orders of his determined enemies.’ Vol. I. p. 142.

But an impartial relater of Irish history would have done justice to the merits of this extraordinary man, who, struggling between two rebellions, destitute of all the sinews of war, and betrayed by the insincerity of the sovereign whom he served, so long maintained the established constitution amidst the distractions of Ireland. If he chose rather to surrender the remnants of that constitution to a parliamentary than a papal usurpation, it is sufficient to remind Mr. Plowden that what he stigmatizes as mercenary treachery, was fully sanctioned by lord Clarendon, a man very little likely to have recommended any disloyal conduct. It is not to disingenuous and perverted statements of fact that we will surrender one of the most brilliant characters which adorn our history.

The true causes of the Irish rebellion are so notorious, that,

were it not for the glosses which Mr. Plowden has attempted to put upon it, we should not even briefly advert to them. That event was intimately connected with the previous as with the subsequent history of Ireland; and forms but a link in the chain of hereditary discontent, which reaches from the expedition of Henry II. to the present hour.

The sense of national oppression, acting upon a high-spirited people, had been rendered a thousand times more biting since the era of the Reformation, by the establishment of rites which they abhorred, by the humiliation of their own religion, and the persecution of its ministers. That, during the reign of Charles the First, this persecution at least had not been very warm, we have above asserted upon historical evidence. But as the most temperate regimen will not speedily restore the bodily frame when enfeebled by dissolute excesses, so in the political system a lenient and forbearing government cannot heal in a moment the wounds which are still smarting from former severity; and the annals of Ireland, in later times, evince but too forcibly this melancholy truth. The plantation of Ulster during the reign of James the First was still recent; and though good political reasons may be alleged for that measure, since the protestant colony of that province is perhaps even at this hour the sheet-anchor by which Ireland is held to the empire, yet it must have been attended with much hardship towards the natives, the resentment of which appears to have greatly operated in the rebellion. These seeds of insurrection now found their time of ripening. Before the eyes of the Irish was the success of the Scotch covenanters, victorious just before in a war of religion; and every catholic must have blushed at the thought, that an heretical cause should prevail by arms, while the true believers still ignobly languished in voluntary bondage. They perceived that the convulsed state of England, tending more and more towards a civil war, afforded them an opportunity which might never recur. Nor shall we deny that the fanatical intolerance which the parliament of England, and still more the covenanters, displayed, might well excite in the most moderate catholic an apprehension, that his communion would soon become the object of a presbyterian crusade. The predisposing causes of great revolutions are to be sought in the philosophy of human nature; the proximate are commonly derived from fortuitous circumstances. A few desperate individuals sprung the mine which had been so long prepared. Of lord Macguire's narrative however, the most important document relating to this conspiracy, Mr. Plowden takes no notice; if he suspected its authenticity, though we see no likelihood in such a suspicion, it should at least have been stated and supported. We shall

not inquire, whether the lords of the pale were concerned in the original conspiracy. But it seems incontestable, that the imbecillity, the fanaticism, the cruelty, of that wretched government which existed in Ireland in 1641, provoked at once and encouraged the progress of the civil war.

Whatever were the causes of the Irish rebellion, its effects were in the highest degree calamitous. Those who are ever ready to applaud conspiracies against established governments, forget that it is not enough to prove existing evils, without shewing a probability that they may be redressed by arms. Of the numberless rebellions which have been recorded in history, it is likely that not one in a thousand has had results advantageous to the interests of human nature. There can be no question, for instance, that the miseries of Italy under the despotism of Nero, were far exceeded by those which she sustained during the succeeding wars of Otho and Vitellius. It is a perilous responsibility of conscience which that man undertakes, who risks at once the certain bloodshed and desolation of civil war, the exasperation of the actual government, naturally rendered more suspicious and severe by popular disaffection, and the many chances of reaching a worse state of tyranny, through long scenes of faction and anarchy. In this unhappy rebellion of 1641, it is the estimate of sir William Petty, that 616,000 persons 'were wasted by the sword, plague, famine, hardship, and banishment;' a number little less than one-half of the population of the country. The forfeitures of the same period, as set out by the court of claims at the Restoration, amounted, according to lord Clare, to 7,800,000 acres; about two-thirds of the superficial contents of the island. But the miseries of that rebellion are not to be measured by these immediate losses of lives and property: they were visited on posterity, beyond the third and fourth generation; and the latent fire, after bursting into two subsequent rebellions, each marked by blood, and one by confiscation, still terrifies, in its smouldering embers, the peaceful inhabitants of Ireland, and the anxious friends of the British empire.

The reign of Charles the Second is dismissed by Mr. Plowden in five pages, in which nothing is worthy of notice but his calumnious misrepresentations of the duke of Ormond's conduct respecting the act of settlement; a measure in which the imperious voice of necessity silenced the remonstrances of justice and humanity, but mitigated by that great man, as far as the inextricable difficulties of the case would admit. In the reign of James II. Mr. Plowden does not wholly deny the misconduct of the prevailing party, but excuses it in many points upon the authority of Charles Leslie. But the said notorious character, though a man of great shrewdness, was

a furious partizan; and, like most men of that description, utterly regardless of veracity. Rather injudiciously, Mr. Plowden has inserted one extract from Leslie, in which he maintains that James had no design of overthrowing the established church; an assertion which not a little shakes his credit as to facts which we cannot at this time of day so positively disprove.

We must cast a rapid glance over the remainder of this work. The catholics, crushed by the arms of William III., experienced all that severity from their conquerors, which resentment of past, and dread of future rebellions, may rather extenuate than justify. Deprived of every political right, and almost all those of property, shut out from the exercise of their religion, they still excited jealousy; and the busy invention of the Irish parliament was harassed with contrivances to render them less dangerous and more miserable. The condition of these people from the reign of Anne to that of his present majesty (we speak the truth boldly, since the times have passed by), was more like that of the Spartan Helots, or the negroes of Jamaica, than the subjects of a paternal monarchy, and common sharers of the British constitution. They were invariably spoken of by lord-licutenants and parliaments, under the periphrasis of 'the common enemy;' nor could any one, without incurring the suspicion of jacobitism, assert in their favour the rights of humanity. Such was the policy of the English government, that it was thought necessary to degrade three-fourths of the Irish to a state of villenage, in order to preserve an ascendancy over the remainder. For there speedily arose a strong spirit of national independance among the protestants of Ireland, the ebullitions of which, sometimes patriotic, sometimes factious, intimidated every successive administration. Two successive primates, Boulter and Stone, retained for near half a century the management of Ireland; and the printed letters of the former sufficiently evince the narrow and ungenerous system which was then pursued. Of lord Chesterfield's vice-royalty, which Mr. Burke has treated with accumulated invective, Mr. Plowden speaks very favourably; we mean so far as it related to the catholics; and certainly the mildness with which he acted at the very moment of the Scotch rebellion, over-balances his assent to one severe law, which has drawn down on him the indignation of the eloquent correspondent of lord Kenmare. In the year 1753, the systematic arrangement of parties took place in Ireland. A protracted contest ensued between the treasury and its opponents; in which the Syren smiles of the former, *vultus nimium lubricus aspici*, seldom failed to lull, sooner or later, into pensioned repose, the stern energies of Irish patriotism.



Throughout all this period, Mr. Plowden seems to us far too much possessed with the pot-house principle, that all governments are in the wrong, and all oppositions in the right; and even in reporting the debates upon the union, of which he is an avowed, and, we presume, a sincere admirer, he cannot help shewing a bias towards the adversaries of ministry. Strongly as we have expressed ourselves as to the prior conduct of England towards the sister country, it cannot we think be denied, that during the present reign a continual stream of concession has flowed in upon Ireland. The vice-royalty of lord Townshend, so much condemned by Mr. Plowden, is still, we believe, celebrated with convivial gratitude at Dublin. Those of lords Harcourt and Buckinghamshire were yet more conciliating. It would be ungracious to answer, that Ireland enforced these concessions; there certainly was no disposition to withhold them. The declaratory act of independence in 1782 crowned the whole; and while it relieved Ireland from a nominal subjection, placed the connection of the two countries on that precarious basis, which left no alternative for the presiding government, but corruption of the Irish senate, or legislative incorporation.

In our free constitution, parliamentary proceedings form often the most important parts of historical narrative. 'Great men,' says Mr. Burke, 'are the landmarks of the state.' Those who wield the complex engine of a democratic assembly, have a right to claim that immortality which it is the boast of history to confer. But that every motley scrap of unmeaning common-place, which an obscure member of parliament has uttered, should be dragged into such a work as the present, and swell it to a portentous size, is what we must strongly reprobate. Accounts of parliamentary debates exist, and it is right they should, as important repertoires, from which the historian is to condense and select what is material. But the desire of book-making overrules all laws of composition: and thus it will be, until some man shall arise, more jealous of fame than eager for money, more solicitous to impart truths worthy of perpetual remembrance, than to propagate idle tales of temporary faction. In the notes upon this part of his work, Mr. Plowden, as if afraid of being too concise, details many contemporary debates in the British parliament (some of them not relating to Ireland, as, for instance, those of the regency), which he very properly borrows from Mr. Belsham. They are indeed both Arcadians; alike prompt to believe, and quick to circulate, every falsehood and misrepresentation which can throw odium upon their adversaries; alike forgetful of the dignified tone in which history reviews the actions of public men; alike able to rouse the reader's anger by their perver-

sions, to excite his smiles by their absurdities, or to lull him into weariness by their prolixity.

When we reach the disastrous æra of the late rebellion, we find our author, though visibly inclined to represent the outrages of the magistrates and the military in the strongest light, yet not uncandid enough to suppress all mention of those which were perpetrated by the United Irishmen. In this he has certainly the advantage of sir Richard Musgrave. It is painful to read these records of atrocious retaliation, by which the protestants of Ireland, especially those of the Orange denomination, sullied their acknowledged intrepidity in the cause of the constitution. Yet we must not weigh in too accurate a balance the actions of men struggling for their very existence against an enemy who knew no mercy. An European in India who had never seen a *cobra di morte*, would probably kill every snake that came in his way: and men harassed by suspicions of every peasant they met; who knew that murderous treason lurked in every household; who for months had never slept unarmed; who heard, day by day, the butchery of peaceful families, and never looked on their children without conceiving them writhing on the pike; may well have been wrought to a state of mind which prompted such acts as may be committed with less guilt than defended. We are aware that this excuse is as valid for the rebel as the loyalist, for the peasant as the noble; and we intend that it should so be taken.

A few observations on the great event of the union shall conclude the present review; and in these we shall endeavour to place the subject in that light in which a dispassionate Irish patriot would consider it. It seems not difficult to prove, that an union was more eligible than the actual state of connection between the two countries immediately previous to it. Ireland had obtained what she fondly deemed a perfect independance in 1782. But while this vaunting name deluded the multitude, it was manifest that she was still in every practical respect subordinate to the councils of Great Britain. Controul over the ministers of the crown is the noblest privilege of the British parliament. But this controul could never be possessed by Ireland. Impeachment, that sword which, though happily rusted in the scabbard, is still, we should ever remember, the avenging weapon of liberty, which may one day be unsheathed; was beyond the grasp of a parliament at Dublin; whose senators might aim their petty lances in vain against an administration which, secure in a majority at home, would smile in scorn at such puny assailants. The measures pursued by a viceroy seem indeed the only constitutional object which the jealousy of an Irish parliament could have reached; but such

measures were commonly planned in the cabinet of St. James's, and the removal of an individual from that high station has often proved no augury of an altered policy. In the mighty questions of peace and war Ireland could take no part; and was compelled to see her exchequer exhausted, and her fields drained of men, for contests which she was alike incompetent to approve or condemn. Her commerce, though much enlarged, still laboured under restrictions which, as they would be the price of union, were not likely to be conceded without it. The nation was feverish with religious and political feuds, the future duration of which might be judged by the past. So slight was the tie which kept the two nations together, that necessity prescribed to government the preservation of that power by influence which was lost by law. A loathsome corruption had tainted to the core that Irish parliament whose independance was so loudly proclaimed; one hundred and sixteen placemen sat among the three hundred members of the house of commons; and the peerage was the notorious and undeniable reward of services which modestly withdrew themselves from public observation. All that remained of independance in this assembly, was shewn only in an implacable determination to resist the introduction of the catholics, who, on their side, in an intemperate pursuit of the few privileges from which they were debarred, seemed careless how much desolation they might be the means of bringing upon the country.

The sole question which could, we think, admit of much doubt, was union or separation; for to the latter the actual constitution was tending, and perhaps most of the zealous anti-unionists, of whatever party, cherished in their hearts the hope that it would one day be effected. Independance is a word of noble sound, and in the fervour of political contest it is not the fault of Ireland alone to have listened without rigorous examination to those imposing names, which more often excite generous sentiments than correct ideas:

'*Taumque*

*Nomen, Libertas, et inanem prosequar umbram.*'

It must be allowed, that the advocates of union went much too far, when they contended that no political incorporation upon equitable terms could be injurious to the liberties of a nation. Certainly they would not readily have allowed, that Great Britain could safely and honourably be embraced in the empire of France, though due provision were made for her participation in the *corps legislatif*, and though it were stipulated in the articles of the pact that not less than twenty of her nobility should, in all time to come, be members of the legion

of honour. The Author of nature has placed, in the physical and moral circumstances of nations, landmarks, which human policy cannot safely over-step. It is probable, though great names may be cited for a different opinion, that America could not have been retained, by any durable legislative union, within the dominion of the British empire. But it does not seem that Ireland is thus naturally separated from the neighbouring island. Independent she could not be without the desolation of protracted war; the success of which would leave her with a population, reduced in numbers, furious with animosity, blinded with superstition, and averse to industry. Her maritime and commercial energies would be checked by Britain in peace, and crushed by her in war; war, which would be perpetually renewed, and in which she must ever be inferior, unless she purchased the humiliation of her adversary by connections most dangerous to her own liberty.

We have hitherto considered the two islands as detached from the rest of Europe, and only in their relation to each other. But wise men do not neglect the signs of the times. The ambition of France, which, for near two centuries, has menaced the independance of western Europe, after bursting through the dams which the providence of our ancestors erected, has spread like a deluge over the adjacent country, and no longer covertly displays its inordinate thirst of power. That her yoke is galling and ignominious to whatever unfortunate nation has endured it, is a truth as indubitable, as it is that Great Britain stands foremost in the breach, and sustains a struggle of such incalculable duration and difficulty, as to make the hearts quail even of those who have the proudest confidence in her energy and resources. In this contest Ireland has borne her full proportion; deprived of Ireland, Great Britain would undoubtedly preserve her own liberty, but must perhaps relinquish the hope of maintaining the interests of the European republic. Ireland herself could scarcely hope for so much; exposed alike to Great Britain and to France, she must select the friendship of one, and would be numbered among the other allies of the Corsican, the respectable and independant sovereignties of Spain, Lombardy, and Etruria.

The particular articles of union seem, for the greater part, just and prudent. In the election of peers for life, and the annihilation of small boroughs, the system of representation is, we think, greatly superior to that which was established by the Scottish union. For the power reserved to the crown of creating new Irish peerages of a limited number, no better reason can perhaps be alleged, than the unwillingness of ministers to part with an instrument of influence. Though rendered necessary, perhaps by the strange admixture of English



gentlemen with the Irish peerage, yet the eligibility of peers to the house of commons, upon waving all their peculiar rights, accords very little with the genius of our constitution. Theoretical writers consider a peer as merely an hereditary senator. But the privilege of being summoned to parliament is, though an eminent part, yet but a part of those characteristics by which the nobility are separated from the rest of the state. The peerage is a distinct order, which would subsist though no parliament, if that could legally be the case, were ever again to be convened. The persons who compose it are, upon constitutional principles, invested with rights inherent in their blood: rights which, whether they will or no, they must transmit to their posterity; and which, in the words of the celebrated protest of 1695, 'nothing can take away, but what, by the law of the land, must withal take away their lives and corrupt their blood.'

Our opinion of Mr. Plowden's work may be shortly expressed; it is no history, but a partial and ill-digested compilation; yet, until a better shall be written, may be found of some value as a book of reference. Each volume contains a copious appendix, some parts of which are useful, and others the contrary. As for the style, it is below criticism.

---

ART. II.—*A Poem on the Restoration of Learning in the East.*  
By the Reverend F. Wrangham, M. A. F. R. S. of Trinity  
College. 4to. 3s. 6d. Mawman. 1805.

IN our number for March last we noticed Mr. Grant's 'Poem on the Restoration of Learning in the East:' the work now before us was an unsuccessful rival of that poem, which nevertheless has been printed at the particular request of those who adjudged the prize—a request equally creditable to themselves and Mr. Wrangham.

India affords ample materials for the speculation of the politician, the research of the philosopher, and the excursion of the poet. The vicissitudes of intellectual light and darkness—the ages of gold and iron which have alternately blessed and afflicted that finest portion of the earth—the powerful and splendid empires, Hindû, Mohammedan, and christian, of which she has been the seat—the renowned conquerors to whom she has given celebrity—her wealth, her religion, and her connection with this country—conspire to attach a peculiar degree of interest to every thing which relates to her.

Our author begins his poem as it were *ab ovo*, with the production of light at the fiat of the Almighty. He bursts upon us at once with the abruptness which Johnson vainly ridiculed

in Gray's Bard. This is adventurous; but the poet is not unsuccessful :

' " Let there be light!" so spake th' Almighty word,  
' And streams of splendor gush'd around their lord.'

Darwin in his Botanic Garden has the two following lines :

' " Let there be light," proclaim'd the Almighty lord :  
' Astonish'd chaos heard the potent word,' &c.

If it be supposed that Mr. Wrangham intended to imitate these lines of Dr. Darwin, it will be admitted that he has excelled them; for the effect of the fiat is in Mr. Wrangham more direct and more appropriate.

We believed ourselves to recognize the same two lines of Darwin, in a poem called 'the Sorrows of Seduction,' which we lately had the mortification to review, in the following curious disguise :

' " Let earth arise," so spake the Almighty lord ;  
And *unfledg'd* earth in chaos heard the word.'

Having just hinted at a possible imitation of Dr. Darwin, we take this opportunity of remarking that Mr. Wrangham is one of the few fortunate admirers of that fascinating poet; he has too much judgment and too much taste to be spoiled by that seductive and dangerous model.

The lines following the two first are nervous and harmonious; in them Mr. Wrangham indulges a supposition that India was the first country visited by the sun's nascent beams: as this is possibly, though not necessarily true, we are not disposed to refuse to him his poetical privilege :

' Forth at that bidding, emulous to run  
His course of glory, sprang the giant sun ;  
And, as he chased the scattered rear of night,  
O'er the wide east diffused his earliest light.  
' There, while his infant beam on Ganges play'd,  
Or hung entranced o'er Agra's spicy glade,  
India, first cherish'd with his orient ray,  
Shone like a bride in brightest colours gay.' P. 1.

He then touches upon the deluge; after which India rose from the waters,

' and rich in nature's charms,  
Rush'd to the sun's invigorating arms.'

After a description of the appropriate richness of Indian vegetation, which is judiciously varied from its antediluvian luxuriance, we are presented with a pleasing view of the early blessings which science lavished upon India :

' Ere revelation flamed from Sinai's height,  
India rejoiced in patriarchal light.  
Tradition there preserved, from sire to son,  
That first great truth, that God is all and one ;  
'Till fabling bards the mystic song began,  
And learned darkness stole on wilder'd man.  
His rigid code then selfish Brahma framed,  
Then for his caste it's proud distinction claim'd ;  
Waved o'er the cheated realm his ebon wand,  
And scatter'd demon-meteors through the land.  
' So born and fed 'mid Turah's mountain-snows,  
Pure as his source, awhile young Ganges flows ;  
Through flowery meads his loitering way pursues,  
And quaffs with gentle lip the nectar'd dew ;  
'Till, swoln by many a tributary tide,  
His waters wash some tall pagoda's side :  
Then broad and rough, 'mid rocks unknown to day,  
Through tangled woods where tigers howl for prey,  
He foams along ; and, rushing to the main,  
Drinks deep pollution from each tainted plain.' P. 3.

In a poem of such great merit we are unwilling to descend to the littleness of verbal criticism ; otherwise it might be observed in the lines just extracted, that 'cheated' is too familiar, too mean a term. 'Demon-meteors' must also be condemned, not only as objectionable in itself, but also as bringing to our recollection the 'demon-ape' of Dr. Darwin, and other combinations of demons which so frequently disgust us in the Botanic Garden. But instead of pointing out to the reader a few petty faults and inaccuracies, we have great pleasure in calling his attention to those musical and stately lines in which the simile of the Ganges is couched, in the concluding verses of the same extract.

We are next told that though the selfish and degrading superstition of Brahma corrupted the patriarchal purity of the Hindoos, still were they not deserted by the sun of science ; but were highly eminent even in those early days for their knowledge of medicine, of astronomy, ethics, music, and poetry.

' Nor only Science led her Indian youth  
With patient labour to the throne of truth,  
Studious by just gradation to refine  
From brute to human, human to divine ;  
But Fancy rapt him on her wing of fire  
To realms sublime, where bliss outruns desire ;  
Where streams of crystal feed ambrosial flowers,  
And love and glory speed the laughing hours :  
'There to his hand resign'd her powers of sway,  
Her lyre, and liquid voice, and numerous lay ;

Gave him her holy hymn, her lofty ode,  
 To sing the chieftain or to sound the God :  
 Gave him her stately epic, to rehearse  
 His Arjun's fame with all the pomp of verse ;  
 When Krishna, mounted on the hero's car,  
 Bore him secure amid the clanging war :  
 Gave him her drama's tearful vase, to pour  
 O'er virtue's sacred anguish pity's shower ;  
 When soft Sacontalà in Canna's grove  
 Press'd the fond pledge of her Dashmanta's love,  
 Or as her steps yet linger'd on the green  
 (Of all her infant sports the happy scene)  
 Wept o'er each flower, her garden's blameless pride,  
 Kiss'd the young fawn that sorrow'd by her side ;  
 And still, to ease her bosom's bursting swell,  
 To flower and fawn prolong'd the sad farewell.' P. 4.

We have selected the above passage, independently of its intrinsic merit, on account of the beautiful allusion in the concluding lines to that elegant drama 'Sacontalà, or the Fatal Ring.' The pleasure which we derived from the perusal of it in sir William Jones's translation made so strong an impression upon our minds, that we earnestly recommend it to our poetical readers. It may be doubted whether even the simple and elegant dramas of Greece can furnish a passage surpassing the delicacy, the sensibility, and the pathos of that, of which Mr. Wrangham has judiciously given the outlines in five admirable couplets.

But the happy ages of Indostan were blasted by the irruptions of Mahmoud the Gaznévide, and Tamerlane.

' And did oblivion quench this hallow'd fire ?  
 May genius like the brood of earth expire ?  
 With meteor front a few short moments soar,  
 Then sink forgotten, and be seen no more ?  
 Ah ! no : by age undimm'd his cheek appears ;  
 His laurell'd brow defies the assault of years.  
 'Twas Mecca's star, whose orb malignant shed  
 It's baleful ray o'er India's distant head.  
 ' Fleet from the stormy west, on steed of flame,  
 To blast her bloom the Bactrian archer came :  
 Beside him rode, twin ministers of fate,  
 The lust of empire and religious hate ;  
 And still, where'er their sanguine banners flew,  
 Spring's rosy splendours vanish'd from the view.  
 ' Her last faint throb of struggling life to crush,  
 See from the north remorseless Timur rush !  
 His drear morasses, and his boisterous sky,  
 The fire-eyed Tartar quits without a sigh :  
 Calls his grim squadrons from their realms of snow,  
 And leads where zenith suns strange lustre throw :



By Bember's foot, who dreary, black and bold,  
Stands the stern guard of Cashmere's vale of gold ;  
Through bowery Matra, where the Gopia nine  
In love's disport with youthful Krishen join :  
There while the mango from it's stem they tear,  
Or light with saffron wreaths their raven hair,  
O'er India's plains the myriad swarms expand,  
And science, genius, fancy fly the land.' P. 5.

The Mohammedan religion is properly enough designated by 'the star of Mecca;' but that 'star' should not have changed a few pages afterwards into Medina's crescent, especially as it is there compared with 'the mild flame of Zion's star.'

The six lines descriptive of the desolating progress of Mahmoud are extremely good ; still we think that the twelve irruptions of that conqueror into Hindostan might have been dwelt upon more at length with great effect. Gibbon, who is himself almost a poet, has related in his most splendid manner some events respecting this monarch, which in Mr. Wrangham's hands might have been rendered highly ornamental, and perhaps have furnished matter for an episode, which is a desideratum in this poem ; for, although the writer touches upon the heads of most of the principal events that have occurred in India from the creation down to the present time; yet a slight appearance of irregularity, an occasional transition to something, not indeed irrelevant, but yet not necessarily connected with the subject, might perhaps have improved the effect of the whole.

We included the last fourteen lines of the above extract, not for their superior excellence, but because we think them more faulty than any other part of the poem. This, we presume, is equitable criticism. In the first place, why is Tamerlane said to quit 'his drear morasses?' Tamerlane quitted Samarcand, the delightful situation of which is proverbial in the east, and is celebrated by every oriental poet. It is situated in the rich and fertile vale of Sogd, so famous for its fertility, and the exquisite richness of its fruits, that they were made an article of commerce, and exported to Persia, and even to Hindostan. But, supposing Tamerlane to quit 'his drear morasses,' it is no wonder (making every allowance for the 'amor patriæ, ratione violentior omni') that he quitted them 'without a sigh;' but if Samarcand be that paradise described by the poets, we should indeed wonder that he could leave it without reluctance, were it not that, in the breast of the hero, the love of power is paramount to the love even of grapes and melons. But the real fact is, Mr. Wrangham wrote this weak line thoughtlessly, and, as we strongly suspect, for

the convenience of a rhyme. Again: Tamerlane's soldiers employ themselves in 'tearing the mango from its stem.' To this we can have no objection, as the mango is an excellent fruit, otherwise it could in no degree contribute to the expulsion of 'science, genius, and fancy.' But they are said also to 'light with saffron wreaths their raven hair;' *i. e.* to relieve the jetty blackness of their hair. (N. B. Mr. Wrangham should have good authority for this use of the verb *to light*.) Now this description may be thought objectionable, as these 'grim squadrons' are called from 'realms of snow,' and as light hair is a characteristic of the natives of cold climates. But still perhaps Mr. Wrangham is defensible; for 'the realms of snow' alluded to are no doubt those mountainous countries to the northward of Samarcand, which are in the same latitude with mount Caucasus, and which form a part of the chain extending across Asia from Mingrelia to Kamschatka: and the Circassians, who are in the vicinity of Caucasus, are remarked both by historians and poets, for their long, black, shining hair.

Immediately after the last-quoted lines follows a simile, in which there is a peculiarity that does not by any means recommend it; for it applies both to what precedes and follows it, and so applies that it is not easy to know which part the author designed exclusively to illustrate. And at the lines,

' Before the fiend the groves of Eden bloom,  
Behind him scowls a desert and a tomb,'

he should have referred us to the third verse of the second chapter of Joel, from which the images are translated: 'The land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness.'

Mr. Wrangham now laments the state of degradation to which Hindostan was reduced under the iron yoke of the Mohammedans; and tells us that it was not till after the irruption of the Mongol Tartars, that those superstitious and sanguinary rites of the Hindû religion, at which humanity shudders, were introduced. This is not quite correct. It is certain that the altars of the goddess Calica had been glutted with human blood long before the religion of Mohammed was even heard of in India. Could it be in consequence of the devastations of Mahmoud, or the despotism of Tamerlane, that the deluded Hindû threw himself under the wheels of Jagrenaut, and through death thus obtained a safe passport into paradise? or that

' from her babes by savage Brahmins borne,  
The widow'd mother clasps her consort's urn;

With ill-feign'd triumph mounts his blazing pyre,  
And sinks, proud trembler! in the sacred fire? P. 8.

By what operation on the human mind could the introduction of Islamism work such a change in the Hindû faith? The professors of the latter could not have borrowed these ceremonies from the conquerors, among whom no such ceremonies existed. The muse of history, like Daphne of old, shrinks with becoming coyness from the too rude encroachments of the poetical assailant.

Next follows a simile, or an illustration, or rather, as we hope and think, an extended description, of the direful effects of superstition: but if a simile was not intended, the first line should have begun with '*Then Elephanta*,' and not with '*Thus Elephanta*.'

But we hasten with delight from these exceptionable trifles in this composition, to our author's happiest effort; to the character of sir William Jones, which is delineated in a manner much superior to Mr. Grant's, and which would have done no discredit to our first poets. European influence gained ground in India as the Mohammedan power declined: after bemoaning, however, in general terms the avarice and ambition of christian governors, which for a long time but ill accorded with the mild spirit of our holy faith, '*'Tis past*,' exclaims Mr. Wrangham,—

' Her bosom stung with conscious shame,  
Awaken'd Albion re-asserts her fame;  
Inclines in pity to a groaning land,  
Wrests the foul sceptre from the spoiler's hand;  
And, greatly lavish in the glorious cause,  
Grants with her Jones her science and her laws—  
Her Jones, high-gifted to fulfil her plan;  
The friend of learning, freedom, truth, and man.  
His were the stores of letter'd time, comprest  
The mind of ages in a single breast;  
The glance to catch, the patience to inquire,  
The sage's temper and the poet's fire.  
In him the wealth of Greece and Latium shone,  
Their Themis, Clip, Erato, his own;  
And his, reveal'd in all their dazzling hues,  
The luscious charms of Asia's florid muse:  
With her o'er Schiraz' roseate plain he roved,  
Where Hafiz revell'd and where Sadi loved;  
On Rocnabad's green marge delighted stray'd,  
Heard her soft lute in Mosellay's sweet shade:  
Then pierced the mazy depths of Sanserit lore,  
While Brahmins own'd a light unseen before;  
Bow'd to their master-pupil, and confest  
With humbled brow the genius of the west.

' But nobler cares are his : for human kind  
 He plies his restless energies of mind.  
 Strung by that orb, beneath whose flaming ray  
 Inferior natures crumble to decay,  
 With growing speed he presses to the goal,  
 And his fleet axles kindle as they roll.

' 'Twas his to bid admiring India see,  
 In law, pure reason's ripen'd progeny :  
 Law, which in heaven and earth holds sovereign sway ;  
 Whose rule the bad endure, the good obey ;  
 Whose giant grasp o'er whirling spheres extends,  
 Whose tender hand the insect-speck befriends ;  
 Her voice of quiring worlds th' harmonious mode,  
 And her high throne the bosom of her God.' P. 9.

After having quoted the above lines, it would be an insult to our readers to point out their several and appropriate beauties ; they speak their own praise with more glowing eloquence than we possess. Who will not recognise the marked and discriminating features of the Justinian of the East ? Who will not admire the happy judiciousness with which Mr. Wrangham alludes to ' the luscious charms of Asia's florid muse, so dear to sir William Jones, and to every lover of poetry ? We are delighted to accompany him in imagination to the groves of Schiraz, where Hafiz united the voluptuousness of Anacreon with the elegance of Horace ; to contemplate the streams of Rocnabad and the shade of Mosellay, where the above poet at once celebrated and enjoyed the wines of Schiraz,\* while his fancy fluctuated between the languishing beauties of Circassia, and the black-eyed dames of his native Persia. In the last lines of the above extract, Mr. Wrangham calls his reader's attention, in a note, to ' a feeble imitation of a sublime passage of Hooker ;' but we cannot allow it to be a *feeble* imitation. To do justice to the great original would be difficult indeed : in one respect however Mr. Wrangham has excelled it ; by the happy influence of a correct taste he has inverted Hooker's order, and by a gradually elevated description has at last seated ' law' in ' the bosom of God.'

With sorrow we make one exception to our unqualified praise of the last extract : it is to the line, ' And his fleet axles kindle as they roll.' We doubt whether we understand this

---

\* ' Boy, bid the liquid ruby flow,  
 And let thy pensive heart be glad ;  
 Whate'er the dreaming zealots say,  
 Tell them their Eden cannot shew  
 A stream so clear as Rocnabad,  
 A bower so sweet as Mosellay.'

Sir William Jones's Translation of an Ode of Hafiz.

line. If the kindling of the axles, which is the natural effect of rapid motion, bear allusion to the death of the illustrious person described, it is at all events improperly introduced here, as nothing should have intervened between that line and the description of his death which succeeds.

Mr. Wrangham then treats us with a poetical lamentation on sir William Jones's death :

‘He falls; bewail’d from where Hydaspes laves  
His sands of gold, to Thames’s distant waves :  
Isis and Ganges weep their sage’s doom,  
And mingle sorrows o’er his early tomb.’

A mind so active as Mr. Wrangham’s should have overleaped the whole distance from the Ganges to the Isis at one bound, and not have been so diffident of its power as first to take an experimental leap from the Hydaspes to the Thames. These movements were not made with Mr. Wrangham’s usual gracefulness and skill.

He then informs us that sir William’s fire was transmitted to the marquis of Wellesley ! We must here be permitted to change our character for a moment, and speak not as critics, but as men. We are sorry, very sorry, that Mr. Wrangham should have so far forgotten himself as to pay fulsome adulation to the marquis, and condescend

‘To heap the shrine of luxury and pride  
With incense kindled at the muse’s flame ;’

and our disgust is perhaps heightened by the recollection of a passage which probably gave Mr. Wrangham the idea of transferring the virtues of sir William Jones to lord Wellesley :

‘Nor all extinct he dies: from earth’s low climes,  
By frailties sullied or obscured by crimes,  
To his own heaven resumed, o’er Asia’s night  
Still shall he shed his tutelary light ;  
Still kindred worth with rival zeal inspire,  
And pour from Wellesley’s urn transmitted fire.’ P. 12.

(N. B. We do not understand the last line.) Who would believe that this compliment to lord Wellesley should have been suggested by a similar one paid to Cato ?

‘At non in Phariâ manes jacuere favillâ,  
Nec cinis exiguus tantam compescuit umbram.  
Prosiluit busto, semiustaque membra relinquens  
Degeneremque rogam, sequitur convexa Tonantis.  
Quâ niger astriferis connectitur axibus aer, &c.

— ‘Illic postquam se lumine vero  
Implevit ;

— ‘vidit quantâ sub nocte jaceret  
Nostra dies, risitque sui ludibria trunci.



Hinc super Æmathiæ campos, & signa cruenti  
 Cæsaris, & sparsas volitavit in æquore classes,  
 Et scelerum vindex in sancto pectore Bruti  
 Sedit, & invicti posuit se mente Catonis.'

Luc. Phar. Lib. 9. v. 1.

But we are told that lord Wellesley is constantly 'subduing and saving' fresh millions. We had hoped that the system of propagating faith by the sword had vanished with the impostor of Mecca, with his namesake of Gazna, and with Tamerlane, and were little solicitous to see it again adopted in the nineteenth century by a christian and an Englishman. But we trust that the happiness provided by Mr. Wrangham for the oppressed Indians in another world, will make ample amends for the loss of relatives, of property, and of life, in this.

The mind turns with pleasure from this subject to the contemplation of that illustrious seat of learning at which Mr. Wrangham was educated, and to which he addresses a very poetical compliment, which the length of our preceding extracts prevents us from laying before our readers. It may be observed by the way, that Mr. Wrangham's allusion to his being a married man should have been omitted; it draws aside a part of that veil which was intended to insure the impartiality of the judges; though we readily admit that in Mr. Wrangham's case a premature discovery would have been more likely to impede than to ensure success.

Passing over the prediction (whose accomplishment is rather to be wished than hoped for) that science, arts, and learning, will shortly flourish in India with renovated and redoubled vigour under the auspices of the English, we proceed to our last selection. It is the description of the wretched condition of the outcast Paria, and of what will be his condition when the happy consequences just alluded to shall have been brought about by the zeal and disinterested benevolence of the East India company.

'What wretch art thou, those desert wilds among,  
 Whose fearful footsteps shun the human throng?  
 Who fly'st to forests, exiled from thy kind,  
 And all thy youth's best transports left behind?  
 Ah! by those streaming tears I know thee now,  
 And the despair that sits upon thy brow,  
 Devoted Paria!\* outcast of thy race,  
 Thrown shivering from thy fellows' fond embrace;  
 Like a blue plague-spot, hapless thing! abhorr'd;  
 Thy touch pollution, and thy doom the sword!

\* The little work of St. Pierre (*La Chaumière Indienne*), mentioned by Mr. Wrangham in a note as containing a striking description of these wretched outcasts from society, we take this opportunity of recommending as a very ingenious, interesting, and instructive novel.

' Yet thee, even thee, shall heavenly science greet,  
Pierce with her sun-bright beams thy dark retreat;  
Restore the blameless joys that once weré thine,  
And close without a cloud thy late decline.  
Yes—thou again the bosom's glow shalt prove,  
The hand of friendship and the lip of love;  
Thee shall the village-cot protect from harms,  
And Brahmins clasp thee with fraternal arms.' P. 15.

We shall entirely abstain from commenting upon these very beautiful lines.

The poem closes with an address to our country, not in the author's best strain of poetry, and a hope that the prevalence of christianity will soon be universal.

Our readers will have observed that this poem has commanded our admiration in all its component parts: the plan, language, style, versification, are all good; the three former with very few exceptions, the latter without any exception; and we cannot more effectually express our high opinion of it, than by earnestly requesting those who are fond of poetry to read it in conjunction with its rival, which has already received our highest praise.

If it be expected that we should now give our opinion upon the justice of the decision on these two poems in question, we will not shrink from this supposed duty; we will not disappoint the expectation, however delicate may be the task, however invidious. On the first perusal of the two compositions, the flowing versification and musical numbers of Mr. Wrangham wrought upon us with uncommon effect. Every true lover of poetry must, at some time, have felt the delusive influence of 'the magic of sweet sounds.' Thus was our judgment charmed by the incantation of numbers, and we ventured to 'hesitate dislike' to the judicial decision. But, on a careful reperusal, Mr. Grant's poem vindicated its injured right. That gentleman's minute acquaintance with Oriental manners and history; his strength and clearness in the developement of metaphysical and moral truths; his skill in dressing those abstruse subjects in versification manly and nervous though often harsh and unmusical, generally ornamented and stately though sometimes tame and cumbrous; these qualifications, so characteristic of poetic genius, operated upon us, as we believe them to have operated on the judges—they determined the prize in Mr. Grant's favour.

Mr. Wrangham however excels him in regular, easy, dignity: he must be admired by all readers, and probably there are many who will prefer his poem to Mr. Grant's; in short, even they who pronounce the latter to be the best poet, will be obliged to confess that the former is the best versifier.

ART. III.—*Barrow's Travels in China.* (Concluded from page 11.)

A COUNTRY in which the rank of a person is ascertained by a comparison of merit, must, unless the examination is conducted on a very frivolous and base plan, produce a considerable improvement of talent and elevation of character. On this subject we looked, but in vain, for information. It is evident that the author had made very little inquiry into this important subject; and the trifling anecdote introduced by him, probably served for a laugh among the Chinese, but cannot be a sufficient foundation for a judgment of their examinations:

‘ These are principally confined,’ says the author, ‘ to the knowledge of the language; and as far as this goes, they are rigid to the utmost degree. The candidates are put into separate apartments, having previously been searched, in order to ascertain that they have no writing of any kind about them. They are allowed nothing but pencils, ink, and paper, and within a given time they are each to produce a theme on the subject that shall be proposed to them. The excellence of the composition, which is submitted to the examining officers, or men of letters, depends chiefly on the following points:

‘ That every character be neatly and accurately made.

‘ That each character be well chosen, and not in vulgar use.

‘ That the same character do not occur twice in the same composition.

‘ The subject and the manner of treating it are of the least consideration, but those on morality, or history, are generally preferred. If the following story, as communicated by one of the missionaries, and related, I believe, by the abbé Grozier, be true, there requires no further illustration of the state of literature in China. “ A candidate for preferment having inadvertently made use of an abbreviation in writing the character *ma* (which signifies a horse) had not only the mortification of seeing his composition, very good in every other respect, rejected solely on that account; but, at the same time, was severely rallied by the censor, who, among other things, asked him how he could possibly expect his horse to walk without having all his legs!” ’ P. 263.

We should be able to form a better opinion if the subject of the themes had been given, and the nature of them laid down according to the ranks of the candidates. The law opinion on a case of murder is drawn up with such precision, that we cannot conceive a candidate to have no other qualification than to make his characters neat, and to select them properly. Some attention will doubtless be paid to his reasoning powers; and he could not write a good theme in this, any

more than in any other language, without much previous application and considerable talents.

As rank depends on merit, it will be as difficult to persuade the natives of China that it should be founded on any other basis, as it is to introduce such a distinction in European nations. To be a *ta-gin*, or great man, the reasoning powers must have been exercised: and it would appear to them ridiculous to expect them in a child or a boy, or to dignify youth with a title which can belong only to a certain degree of age. On this account the embassy incurred no small degree of ridicule, when on shewing the picture of the late duke of Bedford, drawn when he was a boy, they represented him as a *ta-gin*, or great man, of the second order. The Chinese observed to the author, that he surely meant his father was a *ta-gin*. It was then explained that in England age was not necessary to make a *ta-gin*: that some were so at their birth; others on the death of their father, when they were only a few years old; and at the age of twenty-one they were entitled to give votes on subjects of legislation. All this was perfectly unintelligible to the Chinese. They could not conceive it possible for a statesman to exist in the cradle, or frame a law at an age when he could scarcely be free from the discipline of the school. Their *ta-gins* went through a long examination before they arrived at their dignity; and it was impossible for any nation to be so absurd as to trust its laws to the fortuitous accident of birth. The descendants of Confucius are entitled to a degree of distinction, but without any power annexed or any office in the state: it was conceived therefore that the duke of Bedford might be entitled to a similar rank, and he was marked accordingly; but they persisted in refusing to give him the title of *ta-gin*, lest they should incur the censure of the emperor, who would be offended at the ridiculous folly of presenting to him a little boy as a great man.

In architecture the Chinese are represented to be extremely deficient; but on the other hand they must, according to lord Bacon, have arrived at a much higher pitch of civilisation than those countries in which that art has been cultivated with the greatest success: 'For when ages advance in civility and politeness, men come to build stately sooner than to garden finely:' as if gardening was the greater perfection. In laying out grounds they so excel, that lord Macartney gives them the highest praise; and Van-shoo-yuen, the paradise of ten thousand trees, is no where surpassed by the utmost refinement of European taste.

'It would be an endless task,' says his lordship, 'were I to attempt a detail of all the wonders of this charming place. There is no beauty of distribution, no feature of amenity, no reach of fancy

which embellishes our pleasure grounds in England, that is not to be found here. Had China been accessible to Mr. Browne or Mr. Hamilton, I should have sworn they had drawn their happiest ideas from the rich sources which I have tasted this day ; for in the course of a few hours I have enjoyed such vicissitudes of rural delight, as I did not conceive could be felt out of England, being at different moments enchanted by scenes perfectly similar to those I had known there, to the magnificence of Stowe, the softer beauties of Wooburn, and the fairy-land of Paine's Hill.' p. 130.

\* Whether our style of gardening was really copied from the Chinese, or originated with ourselves, I leave for vanity to assert, and idleness to discuss. A discovery which is the result of good sense and reflection may equally occur to the most distant nations, without either borrowing from the other. There is certainly a great analogy between our gardening and the Chinese, but our excellence seems to be rather in improving nature, theirs to conquer her, and yet produce the same effect. It is indifferent to a Chinese where he makes his garden, whether on a spot favoured, or abandoned by the rural deities. If the latter, he invites them, or compels them to return. His point is to change every thing from what he found it, to explode the old fashion of the creation, and introduce novelty in every corner. If there be a waste, he adorns it with trees ; if a dry desert, he waters it with a river, or floats it with a lake. If there be a smooth flat, he varies it with all possible conversions. He undulates the surface, he raises it in hills, scoops it into vallies, and roughens it with rocks. He softens asperities, brings amenity into the wilderness, or animates the tameness of an expanse, by accompanying it with the majesty of a forest. Deceptions and eye-traps the Chinese are not unacquainted with, but they use them very sparingly. I observed no artificial ruins, caves, or hermitages. Though the sublime predominates in its proper station, you are insensibly led to contemplate it, not startled by its sudden intrusion, for in the plan cheerfulness is the principal feature, and lights up the face of the scene. To enliven it still more, the aid of architecture is invited ; all the buildings are perfect of their kind, either elegantly simple, or highly decorated, according to the effect that is intended to arise, erected at suitable distances, and judiciously contrasted, never crowded together in confusion, nor affectedly confronted, and staring at each other without meaning. Proper edifices in proper places. The summer-house, the pavilion, the pagodas, have all their respective situations, which *they* distinguish and improve, but which any other structures would injure or deform. The only things disagreeable to my eye are the large porcelain figures of lions, tygers, &c. and the rough hewn steps, and huge masses of rock work, which they seem studious of introducing near many of their houses and palaces. Considering their general good taste in the other points, I was much surprised at this : and could only account for it, by the expence and the difficulty of bringing together such incongruities, for it is a common effect of enormous riches to push every thing they can procure to



bombast and extravagance, which are the death of taste. In other countries, however, as well as in China, I have seen some of the most boasted seats, either outgrowing their beauty from a plethora of their owner's wealth, or becoming capricious and hypocondriacal by a quackish application of it. A few fine places, even in England, might be pointed out that are labouring under these disorders; not to mention some celebrated houses where twisted stair-cases, window-glass cupolas, and embroidered chimney-pieces, convey nothing to us but the whims and dreams of sickly fancy, without an atom of grandeur, taste, or propriety.' P. 134.

On the religion of the Chinese we meet with little new information. The mass of the people are gross idolaters; what the men of learning are, the embassy had no means of knowing. The language would have been a great obstacle to them, if they had had the means of a free intercourse with a sufficient number to discover their private opinions. Of the language a very good sketch is given, but the account of literature is very deficient; and how can it be otherwise when so very few persons have taken the trouble of learning the language of this extraordinary nation? A multitude of books is known to exist in this empire, but the names of a few ancient ones only are mentioned, and the author seems to have acquired no information on the works that have within the few last years or centuries been published. We are informed, however, that the book of laws is likely to be translated into English: and if the dictionary which is in England was also translated, we should esteem both undertakings as highly creditable to the translators. The nature of the dictionary is well explained, and is a convincing proof of the study and labour that must have been employed on the language.

The characters of the Chinese are well known to be formed by lines and points variously disposed, each character denoting some object in nature, or one formed by the mind. Of these characters about two hundred and twelve are elementary, and may be called keys or roots:

\* These are drawn fair and distinct on the head of the page, beginning with the most simple, or that which contains the fewest number of lines or points, and proceeding to the most complicated; and on the margins of the page are marked the numeral characters one, two, three, &c. which signify, that the *root* or *key* at the top will be found to be combined on that page with one, two, three, &c. lines or points. Suppose, for example, a learner should meet with an unknown character, in which he perceives that the simple sign expressing *water* is the *key* or *root*, and that it contains, besides this root, *six* additional points and lines. He immediately turns over his dictionary to the place where the character *water* stands on the top of the page, and proceeding with his eye directed to the margin, until the numeral character *six* occurs, he will soon per-

ceive the one in question; for all the characters in the language, belonging to the *root water*, and composed of *six* other lines and points, will follow successively in this place. The name or sound of the character is placed immediately after it, expressed in such others as are supposed to be most familiar; and, in the method made use of for conveying this information, the Chinese have discovered some faint and very imperfect idea of alphabetic writing, by splitting the monosyllabic sound into a dissyllable, and again compressing the dissyllable into a simple sound. One instance will serve to explain this method. Suppose the name of the character under consideration to be *ping*. If no single character be thought sufficiently simple to express the sound *ping*, immediately after it will be placed two well-known characters *pe* and *ing*; but, as every character in the language has a monosyllabic sound, it will readily be concluded, that *pe* and *ing*, when compressed into one syllable, must be pronounced *ping*. After these, the meaning or explanation follows, in the clearest and most easy characters that can be employed.

When, indeed, a considerable progress has been made in the language, the general meaning of many of the characters may be pretty nearly guessed at by the eye alone, as they will mostly be found to have some reference, either immediate or remote, though very often in a figurative sense, to the signification of the *key* or *root*; in the same manner as in the classification of objects in natural history, every species may be referred to its proper genus. The signs, for instance, expressing the *hand* and the *heart*, are two *roots*, and all the works of art, the different trades and manufactures, arrange themselves under the first; and all the passions, affections, and sentiments of the mind under the latter. The root of an *unit* or *one* comprehends all the characters expressive of unity, concord, harmony, and the like. Thus, if I observe a character compounded of the two simple *roots*, *one* and *heart*, I have no difficulty in concluding that its signification is *unanimity*, but, if the sign of a *negative* should also appear in the same character, the meaning will be reversed to *discord* or *dissension*, literally *not one heart*. Many proper names of persons have the character signifying *man* for their key or root, and all foreign names have the character *mouth* or *voice* annexed, which shews at once that the character is a proper name employed only to express sound without any particular meaning.\*

P. 251.

The Chinese language is understood in some degree by a greater number of persons than any language now spoken on the earth. The vast empire of China uses the same characters, which are equally known in Japan, Tonquin, and Cochin China, and though the natives of these different countries affix different sounds to each character, and one cannot understand the speech of the other, yet they carry on a correspondence in writing with the utmost facility. Their language is like algebra or the notes of music, equally intelligible in every place where its science has been studied: and we may hence readily perceive, that the degree of proficiency in such a lan-

guage must mark very distinctly each separate class. They who have not learned to write or to read, as we should say, the characters, though it is by no means necessary to annex a sound to every one, must be incapable of any literary pursuit in China, and must, like the similar class in this country, be confined to the lower occupations of life. The class above them, which understands only three or four thousand characters, cannot arise to any office of importance, because the dispatches of government must be unintelligible to it. The man of twenty thousand must be far inferior to him of forty thousand characters, as must the latter be to him of eighty thousand; and the respect paid in China to these various degrees of proficiency is at least founded on as rational a basis as the distinction made in the city of London between men possessed of the same number of pounds, sometimes the effect of chance, or possibly obtained by fraud and treachery. We cannot quit the subject of the Chinese language, without lamenting that so little pains have been taken to introduce us to a better acquaintance with it. Here is a noble object of ambition for the travelling fellows of our universities, who, instead of running the beaten round of classical investigation, might by a two years residence near Canton, bring home a sufficient knowledge of the language to inform us of the present state of literature and science in the country, and also what helps, if any, are to be derived from that quarter of the world towards a more perfect knowledge of the earth and its inhabitants in the times of remote antiquity. We cannot doubt that among the mandarins of high rank, there must exist many sources of information which are hidden to the greater part of the natives, and to the unlettered travellers from Europe.

The difficulties in the language are not so great as are apprehended. They have been exaggerated by commercial men; and the contempt in which such are held in China has been sufficient to discourage them from such a pursuit. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that a friendship might be cultivated between the men of letters, and that a mandarin of China might entertain some respect for an academic when he knew that his honours, like his own, were the result of an examination, and saw him diligently pursuing the study of language instead of enriching himself, like his countrymen, in the sordid occupations of trade. The experiment surely deserves attention, as the results may be equally beneficial to the man of science and the man of commerce. Sir William Jones informs us that the knowledge of three thousand words is sufficient for the colloquial language of any country. The eye can command that number as easily as the tongue; and when we consider the number of words with which a moderate student in the Latin,

Greek, and Hebrew, and only his own or one or two modern languages, is acquainted, we cannot suppose him to require a great length of time, when he has no other occupation, to raise himself to the rank of a mandarin with twenty thousand words. These words are monosyllabic, and varied by the modulations of the voice. The following table shews their nature :

	Initials. Power.	Number of terminations to each.	Number of inflexions or accentuations.
1	Ch. as in Child.	20	131 including aspirates.
2	F.	10	30 no aspirates.
3	G.	11	32 no aspirates.
4	between H. & S.	36	114 all strong aspirates.
5	Y.	16	61 no aspirates.
6	J. as in French <i>Jour</i> .	14	34 no aspirates.
7	K.	37	206 including aspirates.
8	L.	25	66 no aspirates.
9	M.	22	58 no aspirates.
10	N.	23	56 no aspirates.
11	O.	1	2 no aspirates.
12	P.	21	104 including aspirates.
13	S.	29	86 no aspirates.
14	T.	17	105 including aspirates.
15	Ts.	28	147 including aspirates.
16	between V and W.	13	39 no aspirates.
17	Sh.	19	60 no aspirates.
17		342	1331

So that in the whole colloquial language of China, an European may make out 342 simple monosyllabic sounds, which by the help of aspirates, inflexions of voice, or accentuations, are capable of being increased by a Chinese to 1331 words. And as the written language is said to contain 80,000 characters, and each character has a name, it will follow, that, on an average, 60 characters, of so many different significations, must necessarily be called by the same monosyllabic name. Hence, a composition if read would be totally unintelligible to the ear, and must be seen to be understood. The monosyllabic sound assigned to each character is applied to so many different meanings, that in its unconnected state it may be said to have no meaning at all.' P. 265.

It is to be regretted that our travellers were not better acquainted with the language; as the best part of this work is the description of the grand canal, and this would have been doubtless improved by various works written on the same subject in China. The night prevented them frequently from noticing many important objects, and of others they could take only a

cursory glance. What they saw is here faithfully recorded: but this makes a very small part of the work, compared with the remarks of the author, and compilations from other quarters. What a contrast between these Travels and those of lady Mary Wortley Montague! Both writers traversed countries, at the respective times, objects of great interest. The lady tells us what she saw; and in three small pocket volumes introduces us to a number of characters, from whom we can form a tolerable idea of their general manners. Here we have a large quarto filled with dissertations, most of which might have been drawn up without travelling out of England; and the small quantity of information collected by the embassy would have been compressed by the female writer into a compass, certainly not greater than two of her small volumes. China is, however, such an interesting object, that the public will gladly look up to every source of authentic information: and as an author cannot expect to receive the due reward of his labours by a small publication, he must blend with his own knowledge as much as he thinks requisite from other quarters, to adapt his work to the size most convenient to himself and to his bookseller. We have been so much entertained by this work, that we can overlook the error of excess in quantity, which leaves scarcely any thing to be expected from the pen of the ambassador: for the result of the great preparations in England, and the immense expenditure of the emperor, seems to have been only mortification to the former and his suite; ponderous quartos for booksellers' shelves; little addition to our stock of knowledge; and no perceptible advantage to the state.

---

ART. IV.—*An Illustration of Sir Isaac Newton's Method of Reasoning by Prime and Ultimate Ratios; comprehending the first Section of his Principia, and as much of the second and third Sections as is necessary to explain the Motions of the Heavenly Bodies. By the Reverend T. Newton, M. A. F. L. S. late Fellow of Jesus Coll'ge, Cambridge. 2s. 6d. Lunn. 1805.*

THE immortal author of the Principia has not laid down the principles of his method of estimating continued quantity with satisfactory fullness and perspicuity. This statement, we believe, few are willing to controvert: the common complaint of all students who require in mathematics something more than mere rules and methods of computation, is of the obscurity in which the principles of fluxions and of the first section are involved.

Mathematicians of this country and on the continent have imposed on themselves the task of rendering clear what New-



ton left obscure, and of refining into metaphysical exactness those parts of the doctrine of limits which appeared indistinct and ambiguous.

A more cogent motive than the mere desire of elucidating the high and mysterious doctrines of Newton, in years past impelled our mathematicians into explanation. The doctrines were assailed by a man of singular genius and attainments. The controversy occasioned by the *Analyst* is well known: and whatever be the affected or real contempt with which the *mathematical knowledge* of Berkeley is treated, yet his acuteness, his forcible argumentation, his varied illustration, the dexterity of his wit, and the keenness of his sarcasm, ought ever to be admired.

The attack of the *Analyst* produced defences of Newton's doctrine; but not one clear, succinct, and satisfactory explanation of that doctrine. The *Fluxions of Maclaurin* is a precious monument of genius and mathematical learning; but if it vindicates the truth of the doctrine of the new calculus, it is by shewing how problems, in which the properties of continued quantity are concerned, may perspicuously and exactly be solved. This is not exactly the office of a comment. In fact, of the real exactness of the method of fluxions, of prime and ultimate ratios, of equivalent methods, there is no doubt. The controversy has chiefly regarded the explanation and establishment of its principles. These are laid down or are involved in the lemmas of the first section of the *Principia*. They have received and still require illustration. Ludlam, if not, for extent of mathematical knowledge, a mathematician of the first class, yet with great claims to distinction for clearness, precision, and neatness of expression, considers the first lemma as a definition: the author of the present tractate thinks it can be proved; and that what is subjoined to the enunciation of the lemma is, in fact, a proof. Let us attend to the lemma: 'Quantitates, ut et quantitatum rationes, quæ ad æqualitatem tempore quovis finito constanter tendunt, et ante finem temporis illius propius ad invicem accedunt quam pro datâ quâvis differentiâ, fiunt ultimo æquales.'—'Si negas; fiant ultimo inæquales, et sit earum ultima differentia D. Ergo nequeunt propius ad æqualitatem accedere quam pro datâ differentiâ D: contra hypothesin.'

With unimpaired reverence for Newton, we venture to say that this lemma is obscurely worded: it is written with a tacit allusion to methods and their application, familiar to the mind of the author. Propose the lemma to a student acquainted solely with the *Elements of Geometry*, and he shall answer, that he cannot to its truth give either his assent or dissent, since he knows not the exact import of the words, nor the

nature of quantities alluded to. He is unable to affix any precise meaning to the expression of '*quantities tending to equality in any finite time*;' nor to the expression '*ultimately equal*;' except *ultimate equality* means only that kind and species of equality prescribed in the preceding conditions of the lemma. But have not commentators thrown *resistless day* on the obscurity of this lemma? Some very properly and judiciously have first endeavoured to relieve the hard-bound brains of students by the gentle application of examples and illustrations. Others with higher scope have endeavoured to give an independent foundation to the doctrine of limits, by the introduction of general symbols; and have happily succeeded in proving, by circuitous routes, that  $a=a$ , or that if in  $a+x$ ,  $x$  be made 0, the quantity is  $a$ . This abstract and general method must ever, we think, be unsatisfactory; and the illustrations of the author of the present tract are on this, and on other accounts, unsatisfactory.

In his preliminary section on ultimate ratios he says,

'If a variable quantity, either increasing or decreasing, approaches to a fixed quantity, the difference between them being continually diminished, so as at length to become less than any assignable quantity; the fixed quantity is called the limit of the variable quantity.'

'If the ratio of two variable quantities continually approaches to a fixed ratio, so as to come nearer to it than by any assignable difference; the fixed ratio is called the limiting ratio of the variable quantities.'

'As every finite ratio may be expressed in finite terms, the limiting ratios of quantities may, in many cases, be found; when the quantities themselves increase or decrease without limit; as in the following examples:

'Let  $ax+cx^2$ ,  $bx+dx^2$  be two variable quantities, in which  $x$  may be increased or diminished without limit, whilst the other quantities  $a$ ,  $c$ ,  $b$ ,  $d$  continue the same: then, by dividing both quantities by  $x$ , the ratio will be the same as before, and will be expressed by  $a+cx$  to  $b+dx$ ; which, as  $x$  decreases, will continually approach to that of  $a$  to  $b$ , and will come nearer to it than by any assignable difference, as  $cx$  and  $dx$  may become less than any assignable quantity, whilst  $a$  and  $b$  continue the same.

'If the two quantities be divided by  $x^2$ , the ratio will be expressed by  $c+\frac{a}{x}$  to  $d+\frac{b}{x}$ ; and if  $x$  be continually increased, the fractions  $\frac{a}{x}$  and  $\frac{b}{x}$  will be continually diminished; and therefore the limiting ratio is that of  $c$  to  $d$ .' P. I.

The first article labours under the same objection as the first lemma of the Principia: it is too generally and abstractly stated; its very language, at once general and figurative (gene-

ral because it means to include quantity of every kind, and figurative because it refers to a particular mode by which quantity may be conceived to be generated), bewilders the mind of the student. He must demand, if he desires mental conviction, the involved sense of the phrases to be expanded, and their general sense to be particularized by examples and illustrations. Shall it be said that the algebraical instance contained in the above extract removes all difficulty? The ratio of  $ax + bx^2$  to  $cx + dx^2$ , is the same as that of  $a + bx$  to  $c + dx$ : make  $x$  less, then the ratio is nearer, in this last state, to the ratio of  $a$  to  $c$ ; it becomes the ratio of  $a$  to  $c$ , when  $x = 0$ . This may be called, since there is no law forbidding the imposition of terms, the limiting ratio; but what then? is a single step made towards the real and peculiar object of the method of ultimate ratios, the estimation of continued quantity? A hundred such instances, mere algebraical results, but from the introduction of certain terms possessing some shew of novelty and importance, might be unavailingly presented to the student. He would not thereby be taught to investigate expressions for the value of areas and the length of curve lines. The author of the present tract, not satisfied with his preliminary algebraical illustrations (very little more to the purpose, in our opinion, than the geometrical illustrations of Richard Jebb), adds an additional one in a note to the first lemma. After stating the lemma, he says: 'First let two variable quantities which have each of them a limit, continually approach to equality, so that their difference may become less than any assignable quantity: then their limits will be equal:

'As this may,' says the author, 'perhaps be more obvious by making use of symbols: Let  $A$  and  $B$  be the limits of two such variable quantities; and let the difference between the first variable quantity and its limit be  $x$ ; and let the difference between the second and its limit be  $y$ . Then the quantities themselves will be  $A \pm x$  and  $B \pm y$ , according as they are decreasing or increasing quantities, in which  $x$  and  $y$  are decreasing quantities, and may be diminished without limit: Then if  $A$  be not equal to  $B$ , let either of them, as  $A$ , exceed the other  $B$  by any difference  $D$ ; and  $A$  will be equal to  $B + D$ ; therefore  $A \pm x$  is equal to  $B + D \pm x$ , which cannot approach nearer to equality with  $B \pm y$  than by the difference  $D$ , even if  $x$  and  $y$  were supposed to vanish.' p. 3.

Now, guided solely by the conditions that are expressed, why cannot  $B + D \pm x = B \pm y$ , when  $D \pm x = y$ , in which case the limits are not equal? Shall it be answered that the tendency or the approach of the quantities to equality does not cease till  $x$  and  $y = 0$ ? then the proposition means to assert that when  $x$  and  $y = 0$ , if the difference between  $A$  and  $B$  be less

than any assignable quantity,  $A$  and  $B$  are equal, which in fact is laying down a new definition of equality. We have not unfairly stated the alternative: it is not forbidden by previous definitions and explanations; and it is not our business to be solicitous in effecting a reconciliation between truth and the proposition, by supposing the possibilities of emendation and explanation.

Newton, by his method of prime and ultimate ratios, is said to have observed a happy medium: avoiding on one hand the absurdity or obscurity of Cavalierius's principle, and on the other the prolixity of Archimedes's method. Let us, however, form correct notions on this subject. That which has been said, and a thousand times repeated, does not necessarily bear on itself the stamp and title of infallibility. Would Newton, had he solely left to us the first section as it is now found, have advanced considerably the method of computing continued quantity? In our opinion, he would not. The principle of his method was not new: it had been employed by Archimedes; it was known to Wallis and Cavalierius. The benefit science received was from the algorithm of the method, from the simplicity and facility of the rules by which quantity could analytically be computed. This benefit was immense; yet of the practical modes of computing the quadratures of figures, and of the algorithm of the fluxionary calculus, there is no vestige in the Principia. Suppose that the quadrature of a parabola, of which the equation is  $y = \frac{x^2}{a}$ , were to be found.

Newton does not direct us, by any thing expressed in the first section, to find the fluent of  $\frac{x^2}{a}$ ; on the contrary, for estimating the quadrature, we should fall, from the precepts of the second lemma, into the methods of Wallis and Cavalierius: thus, divide the abscissa  $x$  into equal parts  $b$ ; then the sum of parallelograms that have their bases equal to  $b$ , and their sides equal to  $\frac{b^2}{a}$ ,  $\frac{(2b)^2}{a}$ ,  $\frac{(3b)^2}{a}$ , &c. respectively, equals

$$\frac{b^2}{a}(1 + 2^2 + 3^2 + 4^2 + \dots + n^2),$$

$$\text{or } \frac{b^2}{a} \left( \frac{n \cdot (n+1) \cdot (2n+1)}{2 \cdot 3} \right),$$

which does not represent the area of the curve exactly, but represents it the more nearly, the less  $b$  is, or the greater  $n$  is; in the language of the *analysis of infinites*, when the base is infinitely diminished, the sum of the parallelograms, or the area,

$$= \frac{b^2}{a} \cdot \frac{2n^3}{2 \cdot 3} = \frac{n}{3} \cdot \frac{(bn)^3}{a} = \frac{1}{3}$$

of rectangle contained by the base and the extreme ordinate.

In this example and method the principle of the computation is equally exact as in the method of limits, or of prime and ultimate ratios: those mathematicians that have employed it, may, from the use of loose and incorrect expressions, be not exempt from the charge of absurdity of explanation; yet their vindication is not difficult: change the expressions 'infinitely diminished' &c. into 'limits' &c. and the two methods become identical.

What we have said, respects solely the principle of the method of computation; for, as it has been already stated, the rules and processes of fluxionary computation are not laid down in the Principia. If we invest the method of limits with the algorithm of the fluxionary calculus, with the compendium of its processes and the commodiousness of its rules, then indeed between that method and the arithmetic of infinites, or the ancient exhaustions, is the difference immense: let any one endeavour to compute by the latter methods the area of a curve of which the ordinate is  $\sqrt{a+bx+cx^2}$ , or the

length of a curve in which  $y^2 = \frac{x^3}{a}$ , and he will perceive this difference. This therefore is the praise of Newton: that he invented a method of computation, a calculus of easy and most extensive application; a calculus, in its principle not more exact than that by which Archimedes found the dimensions of a circle, but furnished with a simple and commodious algorithm, with rules and processes that reduced the solution of all problems of the same kind to a mere matter of analytical computation. The ancient mathematicians, and the mathematicians immediately preceding Newton, availing themselves of the peculiar properties of certain curves, were able indeed to draw tangents to such curves, and to square them. But by the new calculus tangents were drawn to all curves by the same analytical operation, and their areas found. Archimedes determined the length of the circumference of the circle. We cannot derive from the lemmas of the first section a method of computing it more easily; even the fluxionary calculus does not afford a result with much greater facility and brevity, than the method of the Greek geometer: but then the fluxionary calculus has this advantage, that it finds the length of all other curves by the same process as that by which it finds the length of a circle.

We have nearly lost sight of the author of the present tract, seduced by a desire of shewing that the doctrine of prime and ultimate ratios, in the first section, is not the method of fluxions, and that the claim of Newton to originality of invention (and no one has equal claims) must not be placed solely on the principle of computation laid down in that section. The



reason of his not fairly prefixing his method of fluxions, is to be attributed partly to his fondness for the synthetical form of demonstration, and partly to the fashion of writing with purposed involution and mystery, that prevailed during the times in which he lived.

A commentary on the *Principia*, up to the seventh section, does not require the method of fluxions, properly so called. In that and in the succeeding sections, the method of prime and ultimate ratios under its geometrical form is inefficient for the deduction of certain results which the great author exhibits. Ought not therefore a commentary on the *Principia* to be preceded by a preliminary tract, containing the principles and method of the fluxionary or differential calculus, with the method of ultimate ratios under its geometrical form, subjoined, or connected, or deduced?

We have already said that the author of the present tract considers the first lemma as capable of proof: in his preface he remarks that 'we can hardly suppose that the greatest genius the world ever produced could mistake a definition or self-evident proposition, for a demonstrable one.' We do not admire this kind of argument; it is neither pleasant nor convincing. Why does Newton consider the lemma as demonstrable? The answer is, because after its enunciation he proceeds with 'Si negas,' &c. May not this part be considered as a developement of the meaning of the hypothesis, by the statement of a case wherein the conditions are not those to be observed according to the hypothesis? What are the notions of equality gained by a student from the *Elements*? He is taught that two triangles are equal, when the one can be placed on the other, so as exactly to coincide with it; that right-lined spaces are equal, when they are the sum or difference of such spaces as would cover one another. From such instruction he shall not surely be able to perceive the real and necessary equality between the area of a curve and the ultimate ratio of a series of parallelograms described on the parts of a base. His conceptions of equality are likely to be conceptions of absolute and metaphysical equality: and he may despair of initiation into the mysteries of the sublime geometry, except some plain-spoken friend inform him that curve-lined spaces cannot be measured after the same manner as rectilinear, that therefore it is necessary to devise a new method of computing their values, and that for the sake of abridgment in language it may be convenient to lay down a new test and definition of equality.

Those who maintain that the first lemma does not solely describe a method for computing continued quantity, but that it establishes an absolute equality between the ultimate ratios of the curvilinear figure, and of the sum of the parallelograms,

ought to shew that such equality always happens. What is the case when the figure to the second lemma is the quadrant of a circle?

Whatever is the mode of computation, we are only able to obtain an approximate value of the area of the curvilinear figure.

We have considered hitherto the author's method of establishing the lemmas of the first section: the second and third sections are not difficult to students. The propositions of these two last sections are demonstrated in the present tract with neatness, but without any novelty of remark or illustration. We find little that the commentaries of Richard Jebb, of Le Sueur, and Jacquier, do not supply to the student. We wish the author had composed the first part of his scholium with greater attention to perspicuity and neatness of expression.

Of the exactness of the author's explanation, and of the felicity of his illustration, we have already stated our opinion. But we should not discharge our critical duties faithfully, if we did not express our dissatisfaction at the want of novelty that must be obvious to every mathematician who has sought to understand the works of the great Newton. The algebraical illustrations to the first section, were they satisfactory, would not be new. Why such illustrations are not satisfactory, we have endeavoured to explain. That the Principia are capable of a comment, at once luminous and exact, it is not in our intention to deny; but great difficulties shall await him that undertakes it: yet a task more honourable, and more grateful to English mathematicians, cannot be imposed. Are we contented merely to look up to and admire, as a trophy or proud structure, that monument of his mighty genius which Newton has left to us? Days and nights shall not be fruitlessly consumed by him, who succeeds in explaining the stability of its foundation, the uniformity of its plan, and the artifices of its construction.

---

ART. V.—*A Candid Examination of the Rev. Charles Daubeny's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; in which some of the False Reasonings, Incorrect Statements, and Palpable Misrepresentations, in a Publication, entitled, 'The True Churchman ascertained, by John Overton, A. B.' are pointed out. With Occasional Strictures on the above-mentioned Work of Mr. Overton. 8vo. 3s. 6d. Hatchard. 1805.*

IN an advertisement prefixed to this work, we are informed that it is little more than a transcript of the review of Mr. Daubeny's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, which appeared in

certain numbers of the *Christian Observer* for the year 1804; and which the writer of the advertisement 'has obtained leave to lay before the public in its present form.'

By the nature of this republication, the *Candid Examiner*, it is evident, renounces all claim to the courtesies which are due from us to our brethren of the same profession. His performance is tendered to our examination in the same manner as the work of any other writer; and it challenges our notice by this additional pretension, that having discharged its original and ordinary office, it is thought of importance enough to exert its operations beyond the sphere of the readers of that miscellany in which it first appeared, and to impart the benefits of instructive criticism to the public at large.

We do not ourselves make any professions of infallibility in our critical decisions: and the same, no doubt, is true of the principles of all our competitors. We do not therefore think that we are to be withholden from delivering our unbiassed judgment respecting the present performance, by any considerations of the quarter from which it proceeds. It may indeed be said, 'Who shall decide when doctors disagree?' But in those parts of his work in which our sentiments accord with those of the reviewer of Mr. Daubenys, our additional suffrage may perhaps have some weight with that learned gentleman and with the public; and in those where we differ it cannot be amiss that, if the 'bane' proceeds from one critical journal, the 'antidote' should issue from another.

Besides, did we leave this work unnoticed, we are persuaded that we should not give satisfaction to its author, and might run the hazard also of incurring from him the imputation which is contained in his first paragraph: 'We cannot view these theological conflicts with the cold apathy of some of our critical competitors.' We shall proceed therefore to give an account of the '*Candid Examination*;' and we trust that from this account there will not be any just reason to apply to us the censure which the writer has delivered in the remainder of the above sentence: 'Still less do we find ourselves disposed, after the example of others, furiously to rush into the combat as the bigoted upholders of a party.'

From a comparison of the judgment which is given in this publication respecting the writings of Mr. Overton and Mr. Daubenys, we feel no hesitation (if the authors in this controversy may be arranged in two antagonist divisions) in placing the *Candid Examiner* among the ranks of the Overtonians. As such therefore we have no difficulty in stating that he is the most respectable of the writers on that side of the controversy which have yet come before us. In delivering this opinion we are influenced by a regard conjointly to his experience

and learning on the matters in dispute, to the soundness of his principles, to his talents as a reasoner, and to the moderation and good temper with which he expresses himself. If in some one or more of these particulars he be inferior to any other writer on that side, yet, in a collective view, we prefer him to them all; and especially, in all the qualifications which we have mentioned, we prefer him very far to the self-appointed head and leader of the band, Mr. Overton. This latter gentleman, with a great parade of quotations, did yet scarcely at all penetrate beneath the surface. His materials were all, as far as they respected the primitive writers of the church of England, exceedingly common-place and obvious, and such as had been repeatedly before the public, in the compilations of Messrs. Toplady, Bowman, &c. &c. The Candid Examiner, however, though, as we shall soon see, he travels too much in the beaten course, and has preserved more than a sufficient share of the old traditional mistakes and errors of his associates, has yet manifested a considerable acquaintance with the writings of the reformers, and the history of the religious opinions of their days. Hence it is that he has successfully exposed some errors of Mr. Daubeney, and has thrown out several remarks which may well deserve the attention of that gentleman.

The writer has shewn a commendable spirit of moderation, where he declares his persuasion that it was not in the design of the governors of our church to exclude either Calvinists or anti-Calvinists from her communion, or even from ministering at her altars; and we are well convinced that the documents of those times will bear him out in his position. If therefore this writer be correct (we insert this proviso, not that we have any other reason for it, but merely because we have not Mr. Daubeney's work at hand to satisfy ourselves of the fact) in stating the extent to which he affirms that Mr. Daubeney maintains the contrary opinion of the resigned exclusion of the Calvinist, he has our suffrage along with him, and, with whatever reluctance, we must declare our dissent from the learned and zealous archdeacon. We approve further of the feelings which impel him to wish that the names both of Calvinist and Arminian were mutually disclaimed by all ministers of the church of England, and the use of them mutually forborne. The distinction which he has laid down in another place between the Calvinist and puritan, is well founded. His remark respecting the use of the term 'second justification' when applied to our final acceptance with God, that 'in the age of the Reformation no one instance occurs of any protestant writer, who either directly asserts, or can fairly be interpreted to imply, such an use' (p. 88), is, though not *strictly* true, yet



very nearly so : and the remarks adduced in support of the alleged necessary connexion between true justifying lively faith, according to the mind of our church, and the works of the Spirit, are, upon the whole, worthy of the consideration of Mr. Daubeny. In these points, we think, the labours of this writer are commendable. And, though we are of opinion that he has a very inadequate sense of the manifold literary enormities and vices of Mr. Overton, yet we account it something gained that he does not see in that author, like many of his adherents, all beauty and perfection ; but has, though with a very soothing and gentle hand, intermixed and tempered the sound of the scourges directed to the shoulders of Mr. Daubeny, with a few friendly strictures upon 'the True Churchman ascertained.'

Yet, when we said that this author is preferred by us to all the other champions on that side in the debate, and that he has displayed qualifications for the controversy superior to those exhibited by the rest of them, it must not be supposed that any very high praise was intended, or that we look upon his accomplishments as at all, from their positive and internal excellence, requiring any extraordinary contribution of admiration or applause. He shines amid the twinkling of lesser fires. He may be accounted rich, because his brethren are poor. Perhaps no controversy can be named in which so much false reasoning, so many incorrect statements, palpable misrepresentations, ill-humoured and caustic insinuations and charges, have been poured out upon the public, as have appeared (we might say, we fear, on both sides ; but as have appeared, we will say, more especially) on the Calvinistic side in this controversy, from its very beginning to the present day, upon the several occasions when the genius of Calvinism has revisited the earth, and in a more especial manner aroused his partizans to fresh warfare ; which, if we make no error in our calculation, has been, comet-like, after an interval of every thirty years, or thereabout, since the era of the Reformation. Accordingly it will be found, that the Candid Examiner, notwithstanding the portion of praise which we have allowed him, has, where his remarks are new, too frequently only given birth to new errors ; where they are old, he has, too much in the way of his brethren, handed them forward to the next comer with all or more than all the load of original imperfections on their heads. To his views and principles (especially those relating to the sacrament of baptism) we can by no means grant our unqualified approbation : and with regard to that leading object of his work, the communicating to his readers an adequate judgment of the value of Mr. Daubeny's *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, we are compelled to say that in our opi-



nion he has failed very materially; he has written, we fear, too much in the character of an adversary; the 'evil manners' of that author he has engraven on 'brass,' his 'virtues' are written, as it were, in 'water.'

We proceed to shew, in some particular instances, how this writer has exemplified in his practice several of the principal errors into which the Calvinistic disputants, especially as the controversy is now carrying on under the auspices of Mr. Overton, are so exceedingly prone to fall.

The first which we shall specify is in the misapplication and misuse of terms, and those such as respect the very essence and foundation of the controversy.

At p. 408 Mr. Daubeny observes, that though the names of Luther and Zuingle are introduced into the Apology for the English Church by bishop Jewell, yet the name of Calvin does not once occur throughout the whole performance. But is Mr. Daubeny aware how very frequently the name of that reformer occurs in bishop Jewell's *Defence* of the Apology, and with what honour he is always mentioned?

'His antagonist Harding is continually reviling the bishop as a disciple of Calvin (Jewell's *Defence*, p. 152, and elsewhere, edit. 1611) and the English protestants at large, under the title of *Calvinists*. (Ib. p. 25, and elsewhere.) The bishop never disavows the charge, and he sometimes defends Calvin in terms of high respect. "Touching Mr. Calvin, it is great wrong untruly to report so reverend a father, and so worthy an ornament of the church of God, &c." p. 106.

The remark of Mr. Daubeny, which is referred to in this passage, is in truth of no great value, and we do not wish to say a word in its defence. But, in lieu of it, we can help that gentleman to one which he will know well how to estimate, which the Candid Examiner will not despise, and of which we wonder greatly that it should be now to be produced for the first time (which we believe to be the case) in this controversy. Every one knows the importance of bishop Jewell's Apology. In some respects its authority, about the times when it was issued, was higher than that of the thirty-nine articles. It was tendered to the christian world as a complete and authoritative draught of the principles of the reformed church of England. In its own words,—'Exposuimus universam rationem religionis nostræ, quid de Deo Patre, quid de ejus unico filio Jesu Christo, quid de Spiritu Sancto, quid de ecclesia, quid de sacramentis, quid de ministerio, quid de sacris scripturis, quid de cæremoniis, quid de omni parte persuasionis christianæ, sentiamus.\*' (Enchirid. Theolog. Vol. I. p. 339.) Yet not-

\* 'We have declared at large unto thee the very whole manner of our religion, what our faith is of God the father, of his only sonne Jesus Christ, of the

withstanding these large and comprehensive expressions, 'the very whole manner of our religion,' 'every part of Christian belief,' we shall seek in it in vain for any doctrine of predestination. There is not a word in the whole book respecting election, predestination, or reprobation, excepting that, in p. 265 (*Enchir. Theol.*), where he is talking of the corruptions of the Romish church, a reference is made to Matth. c. 24, v. 24, '*insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.*'—But all this is by the way.

To return then to the Candid Examiner. 'Harding is continually reviling the bishop as a disciple of Calvin, and the English protestants at large under the title of Calvinists, and the bishop never disavows the charge.' Let us hear the bishop himself, in one of the places referred to by the Examiner (p. 23): 'And here he (Harding) reckoneth up by rote a many of names of his owne making, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists.' (Jewell, p. 198.) This surely may be interpreted, without a stretch, to be something not very unlike a disavowal of the name. And we could bring a great deal more to shew that Jewell's feelings might have been more truly expressed, 'as wee have no religion but onelie Christes, so desire we to be called after the names of none but his, and as we bee, so to be *named Christians.*' But to let this pass; has the writer told us here all that he knows of the term Calvinist, as it was objected to the English protestants by Harding and many other Romanists? Whether he has or has not, it will behove us to be a little more explicit. What then, if, by the same rule, Cranmer might be proved to be a Calvinist? But that is a very small matter. What if, by the same rule, the learned and excellent Dr. Hey, in spite of himself, and, in Dr. Hey's judgment, all the church of England, in spite of themselves, might be shewn to be Calvinists? 'The Romanists and Lutherans,' says that valuable writer, 'would not deny, either that eating Christ's body is a commemoration, or a partaking of the benefits of a sacrifice; nor should we CALVINISTS; but still, every thing between the precept "take, eat," and the obedience to it (including the reward or benefit), is human.' (Lect. in Divinity, Vol. 4, p. 339.) In the sense in which Dr. Hey has here used the term *Calvinist* (with reference to the doctrine of the sacrament, and to nothing else), in this very sense and in no other, in reference to this very doctrine of the sacrament and nothing else, was that term applied by Harding and the other Romish writers, in the times of Jewell, to the English protestants. What,

therefore, the fact of the imputation of this name, in such a meaning, can have to do in the present controversy, respecting those matters which did not, till several years afterwards, obtain the name of the *Calvinistic points*, we are unable to perceive. For any such purpose, there is not any name in the whole vocabulary, whether of Romish or Protestant appellations of reproach, which it would not as well have suited the argument of the Examiner to have shewn applied to Jewell and his contemporaries. The author, therefore, has done here not merely nothing, but what is worse than nothing; for he has done that which is very well calculated to mislead and to deceive.

We have a quarrel also, not very unlike the above, against his use of the names Arminius and Arminian in pages 68 and 69, as gathered from a passage in bishop Hall, and another in Isaac Walton. But we must forbear; lest our 'candid examination' should grow to be almost as large as the Examiner's, and it should become necessary for us 'to obtain leave to lay it before the public in another form.'

Instead of our argument, we shall however tell a short story, which will point the minds of our readers to the same moral to which it would have been the object of our argument to have drawn them.

The 'brazen mouths' of their adversaries so far prevailed, that the name of Arminian stood, for many years, for nothing better than a strange compound of popery and Socinianism. Mr. Bull (afterwards the far-famed bishop of St. David's) informs us, that his family suffered temporal losses, and, what grieved him a great deal more, the efficacy of his ministerial labours was very much impaired, by the charges of Socinianism which were reiterated against him by his Calvinistical opponents. (*Apolog. pro Harmon. p. 10.*) Yet this was the man who had then composed (*Ibid. p. 8.*), and did soon after publish, that illustrious Defence of the Nicene Creed, which has ever since been regarded as the best vindication of the Catholic faith which modern times have produced.

To go on from *terms* and *single phrases*; the next fault with which we have to tax the Examiner is, that he does not always rightly understand and interpret the *passages* of our ancient writers, upon which he erects his arguments. There are several reasons which give birth to frequent repetitions of this blemish among the writers in this controversy. A very copious source of them exists in the want of familiarity with our ancient idioms, and in an ignorance or inconsideration of the changes which have taken place in the English phraseology. We have seen, for instance, in two recent Calvin-

istical writers, with every appearance too of its having been borrowed from a third, an argument urged with great gravity, to fix upon a work the doctrine of idolatrous worship, which would equally as well prove that every man who is married in one of our churches is guilty of that sin, and which would run us into hazard of the same imputation when we speak, after the fashion of one of our universities, 'of the *right-worshipful* the vice-chancellor, or the *worshipful* the mayor.'

'Hooker says, "All receive not the grace of God which receive the sacrament of his grace." (Book v. c. 57.) No author is more express as to the efficacy of the sacraments, and the necessity of our using them, than he is; but, by comparing different parts of his works together, it will appear, that he did not extend their virtue in that unlimited and indiscriminate manner which Mr. Daubeny appears to do in this chapter. Speaking, as he generally does, in the name of real believers, he says, "Baptism both declareth and maketh us Christians. In which respect we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life; a seal, *perhaps*, to the grace of election before received; but to our sanctification here, a step that hath not any before it." And, in the margin, quotes, in confirmation of the foregoing phrase in italics, "He which is not a Christian before he come to receive baptism, cannot be made a christian by baptism; which is only the seal of the grace of God before received." Hooker here evidently speaks in a more Calvinistic strain than many will approve of; but be that as it may, the word *perhaps* in the text, and the passage quoted in the margin, evidently shew that he did not consider grace as necessarily annexed to the reception of baptism. We are as fully sensible as Mr. Daubeny can be of the holy efficacy of the baptismal sacrament, and of its important connexion with the scheme of redemption; much more so, indeed, than our present limits will allow us to explain; but we object to some of Mr. Daubeny's expressions, because we are convinced that he carries the authorities from which he quotes into more general conclusions than their known principles will warrant.' p. 78.

It is remarkable that the Candid Examiner should find words to tell us that 'Hooker here evidently speaks in a more Calvinistic strain than many will approve of,' in reference to certain expressions taken from a passage which is perhaps the one which very many inquirers would pitch upon as the most anti-calvinistical in the whole *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Let us lay the passage more at large before our readers; and then let them judge whether the context, and train of argument, might not have led this writer to suspect some mistake in his interpretation. It constitutes (for in the Candid Examination the reference is forgotten to be inserted) a part of the 60th section of the fifth book.



\* There are that elevate\* too much the ordinary and immediate means of life, relying wholly on the bare conceit of that eternal election, which notwithstanding includeth a subordination of means, without which we are not actually brought to enjoy what God secretly did intend; and therefore to build upon God's election, if we keep not ourselves to the ways which he hath appointed for men to walk in, is but a self-deceiving vanity. When the apostle saw men called to the participation of Jesus Christ, after the gospel of God embraced and the sacrament of life received, he feareth not then to put them in the number of elect saints; he then accounteth them delivered from death, and clean purged from all sin. Till then, notwithstanding their preordination unto life, which none could know of saving God, what were they, in the apostle's own account, but children of wrath, as well as others, plain aliens, altogether without hope; strangers, utterly without God in this present world? So that by sacraments, and other sensible tokens of grace, we may boldly gather, that he whose mercy vouchsafeth now to bestow the means, hath also long since intended us that whereunto they lead. But let us never think it safe to presume of our own last end by bare conjectural collections of his first intent and purpose, the means failing that should come between. Predestination bringeth not to life without the grace of external vocation, wherein our baptism is implied. For as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we christian men in the eye of the church of God but by new birth; nor according to the manifest ordinary course of divine dispensation new-born, but by that baptism which both declareth and maketh us christians. In which respect, we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal perhaps to the grace of election before received; but to our sanctification here, a step that hath not any before it. There were of the old Valentinian heretics which had *knowledge* in such admiration, that to it they ascribed all, and so despised the sacraments of Christ, pretending that as ignorance had made us subject to all misery, so the full redemption of the inward man, and the work of our restoration, must needs belong unto knowledge only. They draw very near unto this error, who, fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of *faith*, imagine that nothing but faith is necessary for the attainment of all grace. Yet is it a branch of belief, that sacraments are in their place no less required than belief itself.' (Vol. II. P. 247-9. 8vo edit.)

It is a *new thing*, we presume, to hear of Hooker confirming

---

\* We are almost ashamed of making an observation so obvious, but it will exemplify a remark which we have just made, to note that this word is not here used as we now-a-days apply it, for to extol, but for its opposite, to detract from, to depreciate. REV.

† T. C. lib. 3. p. 134. 'He which is not a Christian before he come to receive baptism, cannot be made a Christian by baptism; which is only the seal of the grace of God before received.'



his phrases or his sentiments by reference to the redoubted puritan, T. C. (Thomas Cartwright.) Before we come to consider the word 'perhaps', let us compare with Hooker one or two more particles of this short extract from Cartwright, for the sake of seeing in how beautiful a manner they accord with, and *confirm* each other.—T. C. 'He which is not a christian before, *cannot be made a christian by baptism.*' Hooker, 'we are not *new born*, but *by that baptism* which both declareth and *maketh* us christians.' Again: T. C. 'which is only the seal of the grace of God *before received.*' Hooker: 'the chiefest force and virtue of sacraments consisteth in that they are; first, as *marks* whereby to know *when* God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof; and secondly, as *means conditional* which God *requireth* in them unto whom *he imparteth* grace.' (Vol. II. P. 238.) Again: 'we take not baptism nor the eucharist, for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonials assuring us of *grace received before*, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for *means effectual*, whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify.' (Ibid. P. 240.) The brevity of the writer's expressions with regard to the word *perhaps*, is such, that even with the aid of his italics, and the reference to the margin, we are not enabled to state with precision *how* he misunderstands and misinterprets Hooker, but can only state that from them all together, and from his conclusion ('that he did not consider grace as necessarily annexed to the reception of baptism'), he does misunderstand him. For this is Hooker's argument: 'We hold baptism to be the *door* of our *actual* entrance into the house of God, we call it the *first apparent* and visible beginning of life; it may perhaps be called (as you denominate it) a seal to the grace of election *before received*; let it be granted that the grace of election cometh first, baptism is the seal to ratify and convey it to us: but however this may be, whatever were the previous intentions of God, they were secret to us and to all men; whatever was our pre-ordination unto life, none could know of it saving God, till the hour came in which we were baptized, an hour which, whatever may be said of its preceding or following after election, does evidently constitute the first step in the initiation into that which is equally necessary to salvation as our *election* is, namely our *sanctification*.' This is the meaning of Hooker, and in what way it can operate to separate grace and baptism we do not understand. If it had any such operation it would not be the doctrine of Hooker, who maintains (as we believe Mr.

Daubeny does) a necessary connection between them, not a physical, but a moral necessity : or, as he expresses it, 'where the signs and sacraments of God's grace are not either through contempt unreceived, or received with contempt, we are not to doubt but that they really give what they promise, and are what they signify.' (B. 5. Sect. 57. p. 239-240.)

In an argument depending upon historical evidence so much as that does which is now at issue between those who maintain and those who deny the Calvinism of the principles of the early ornaments of our reformed church, it is of very great importance that the evidence which is brought forward should be as fair and legitimate as can possibly be found. It is certain that without this precaution we must be tossed about without end in a sea of controversy. We approve therefore of the zeal with which the Candid Examiner enjoins upon Mr. Daubeny the necessity of a scrupulous regard to the accuracy of his quotations. And yet we are not sure that the Examiner is himself always so careful in his own practice in this matter, as might have been wished for ; nor that he is quite free from that fault which he imputes without much reserve to Mr. Daubeny. 'It is remarkable' (says he, in p. 34) 'that these very divines' (meaning the deputies of James at the synod of Dort) 'appeal to the writings of St. Augustine, Melancthon, Calvin, Bullinger, and even Paræus, together with the church of England, as holding similar tenets with their own.' This, we do not deny, is all of it true ; but yet it is not the whole truth. After the name of Calvin, in the original document (p. 190 of ours, which is the second edition), there follow the words 'in sundry places', thus 'of Calvin in sundry places ;' intimating, we doubt not, their knowledge, that there were other pieces of Calvin, as indeed there are, not only utterly irreconcilable with, but flatly contradictory to, the doctrine of universal redemption. It would therefore have pleased us better to have seen the words inserted in their proper order ; more especially because Mr. Daubeny has, in the very work which is the subject of this writer's animadversions, asserted that there is a glaring inconsistency in the works of the celebrated reformer, with regard to that tenet. (See Daub. Vindic. p. 456-7.)

Again, in the same page :

'In corroboration of our opinion, that the assertion of universal redemption is not inconsistent with the holding of what are usually called the Calvinistic points, we would refer the reader to what is said of the celebrated Martinus, of the Lutheran church of Breme, who, though he held the doctrine of redemption in a sense nearly as extensive as that maintained by the remonstrants themselves, is nevertheless said by Dr. Balcanqual, in his letter

from the synod of Dort, "to be as *sound* in all the *five* articles as any man in the synod," (Hale's Remains, p. 480.) and actually subscribed his name to all the synodical canons. (See Acta Synod. Dordora.)' p. 34.

'We should have withholden any remark here, had the author written, 'that the assertion of universal redemption is not inconsistent with the holding (of the remainder of) what are usually called the Calvinistic points.' We have never heard but that the extent of man's redemption by Christ's death was the subject of *one of those points*, and a most important branch of the quinquarticular controversy; and therefore, in citing the testimony of Dr. Balcanqual respecting Martinus, the writer ought to have gone on a little further, and then it would have stood thus: 'to be as *sound* in all the *five* articles as any man in the synod, *except the second*, in which, when the canons come to be made, your lordship shall hear there will be more of his opinion besides himself.' (p. 109. edit. 2.) So much however is due to the Candid Examiner as that we should testify, that the omission which we have noted is not of any very great importance, that it might very easily take place through inadvertency, and that we are very willing to believe that it was incurred without the smallest intention to mislead.

But besides the incorrectness and inaccuracies in the particulars of evidence which are adduced in this controversy, and the frequent misinterpretation of testimonies correctly cited, we have repeated occasion to complain of endeavours which are made without adequate reason, to destroy the credibility of witnesses, and to impeach in a mass the worth and value of entire documents. The present writer has given us too much occasion to ascribe to him a share in this unworthy proceeding. The frequency and severity of his remarks with regard to the integrity of Heylin and Collier (see p. 30, 32, 36, 40, 101.), are, in our opinion, far from being justified by his reasons, his authorities, or, what is better than either, by matter of fact. Collier was indeed a non-juror, and his principles of church-government were higher than that we should be disposed to defend them. But what then? To Collier (considering our poverty in that particular) the ecclesiastical history of this country is greatly indebted. Errors he may have committed, nay discolourings and misrepresentations he may have been guilty of (for what historian is free from them?); but it will require better arguments than the loose reflections of the Candid Examiner, before the public shall arrive at this conclusion, that, in general, Collier is not to be trusted. We do not entertain any very extraordinary esteem for Peter Heylin; but this we must say, that our ob-

servations by no means lead us to assent to the conclusions of this writer, when he affirms 'that we do not know of any author, ancient or modern, in whose pages is to be found a larger portion of *false reasonings, incorrect statements, and palpable misrepresentations*' (p. 31); nor do we think that much is gained to his opinion, by the foolish testimony of Burnet. We cannot call it by a gentler name, because its falsehood will immediately appear to any one who will open the volumes to which Mr. Daubeny may have been indebted.

In justice to the injured name of Collier, let us be permitted to observe, that there is not another remark so valuable (nor any which is more true) in the whole *Candid Examination*, as one which the author has transcribed (p. 36) from that writer. 'In a word' (says Collier, p. 191), 'where the *Erudition* differs from the *Institution*, it seems mostly to lose ground, to go off from the primitive plan, and to reform backwards.'

Whether Mr. Daubeny, and the other patrons and admirers of the *Erudition*, may startle when we make this important concession, we cannot tell; nor are we very anxious to know what conclusions the *Candid Examiner* may gather from it. Important however as the concession undoubtedly is, yet we shall not be deterred by it from adding the name of the *Candid Examiner* to the long list of those writers who have attempted by very undue and unfit means to depreciate the value of that performance, to brand it with the name of popery, and under that imputation to proscribe it from the present controversy, to drive it out of the ring by their hisses and reproaches. It would make a volume of no small size, to expose as they deserve the blunders and misrepresentations of which the Calvinistical writers have been guilty in their endeavours to detract from the worth and value of this single document, so far as respects its relations to the present disputes. The *Candid Examiner* is very far from running into the extraordinary statements which have disgraced some of those performances. The general tendency however of his remarks, partakes a great deal too much of an affinity to their views; and by an observation which is new, the author has added one more item to our list of matters which have been said amiss in relation to that volume. The remark is specious; and we shall notice it, because it will supply us with a commodious instance whereby to justify the precept which we have continual occasion to recommend in the present controversy, viz. that both writers and readers should proceed with much more cautious steps, more vigilant eyes, and less confidence in their friends, than they used to do.

‘ It ought to be known, that so highly did bishop Bonner value the Erudition of a Christian Man, and so accordant did he consider it to his own sentiments, that he incorporated the most considerable part of it into a work which he himself published in queen Mary’s reign, in order to promote the re-establishment of popery in his diocese. Of so very dubious a description is this work, so frequently appealed to. Of this and all other, &c.’ p. 36.

Well! What fault is there to be found in all this? Is it not true? Yes, every word of it. But, we shall try whether we cannot ourselves make another argument, which shall be of almost as much value. He who will look into Bonner’s book will find upon what our argument is grounded:—‘It ought to be known, that so highly did bishop Bonner value the *first book of Homilies*, and so accordant did he consider it to his own sentiments, that he caused a considerable part of it to be incorporated into a work which he himself published in queen Mary’s reign, in order to promote the re-establishment of popery in his diocese. Of so very dubious a description is this work, &c. &c.’ Alas! alas! these are arguments which can never lead us to any profitable issue. Popery is still christianity. Her touch is not quite so deadly wherever it comes. The ‘Necessary Doctrine and Erudition’ is still a work of first-rate value and importance; and the application of it by Dr. Hey, by the bishop of Lincoln, and even by Mr. Daubeney, is, with some slight modifications, justifiable and laudable.

The Candid Examiner seems sometimes to put an interpretation on the motives and proceedings of Mr. Daubeney, more harsh and unfavourable than they require. Having remarked that the eighth chapter of Mr. Overton’s work is passed over in silence by the author of the *Vindicie*, he goes on to ask, ‘What can be the reason of this particular exception? Was he averse to exhibiting Mr. Overton to the public as the strenuous defender of our established forms of doctrine and worship, both as valuable in themselves, and as consistent in all their parts with scripture? But whatever may have been his reason for failing to do this, it will scarcely admit of a vindication on the score of candour and liberality.’ p. 99, 100. We are very unwilling to believe that Mr. Daubeney’s silence could proceed from so uncharitable a cause as that to which we are directed to ascribe it by the Examiner. And it is exceedingly important, in a moral and religious view, that insinuations of such a nature as this should not be propagated, unless they can be substantiated by very satisfactory evidence. We can ourselves help the Examiner to a solution of this phænomenon, which perhaps may be at least as near to the true one as that which he has suggested. We have in



our possession a copy of Mr. Overton's work, in the margin of which we remembered to have noted with our pencil a few such matters as occurred to us in a perusal of it, a long time ago. We were curious to know whether any thing appeared there respecting this eighth chapter. We transcribe literally from our pencil-marks, the two following observations upon its general contents. 'Scarcely a word to the purpose.' This we found written over-against Chap. viii. in the table of contents, at the beginning of the volume. And on turning to p. 333, at the commencement of this chapter, we read this laconic interrogatory, 'Why all that follows?' Perhaps, therefore, Mr. Daubeny's silence contains nothing worse in it, than a peaceable, unpretending, christian-like forbearance. We believe indeed, that had we been in Mr. Daubeny's place, we could not have been silent, on the occasion of this eighth chapter. But the argument of our speech would have been, not to commend Mr. Overton, but to shew that this part of his work contains its share of that controversial management and disingenuousness which so exceedingly pervades and disgraces the whole volume.

We have noticed some other blemishes in the Candid Examiner's methods of argument, distinct from any of the above, which might have required animadversion, had we been desirous to render our catalogue complete. But we are admonished to press forward :

“*Singula dum capti circumvectamur amore.*”

Towards the end of his work, the writer appears to summon all his strength. It will be attributed to our candour, that it is from this strong-hold that we give him an opportunity of speaking for himself.

‘Those who pursue Mr. Daubeny's facts and arguments to their primitive source will perceive, that, by following unsafe guides himself, he often becomes an unsafe guide to others. The various instances of error and misstatement, which we have already produced, will prove to the satisfaction of the impartial reader, that he is very far from being either a safe guide or a satisfactory reasoner. His mistakes too are of such a nature, as plainly indicates some important misconceptions in his general view of those questions which he has undertaken to discuss: and, in several instances they are so very extraordinary, that, as the intelligent reader will have seen, they furnish powerful weapons against himself, and even overthrow some of his most laboured positions; particularly those which affirm the *designed* exclusion, on the part of our reformers, of a Calvinistic interpretation of the thirty-nine articles, and those also which respect the nature of faith, and its office in the justification of a sinner. On the first point, such a variety of luminous evidence stands opposed to Mr. D.'s hypothesis, that we

do not hesitate to affirm, that nothing but a very prejudiced or partial view of the subject could lead any inquirer after truth to adopt it. With respect to the questions of faith and justification, Mr. D., as has been already shewn, adheres to those views which are to be found in king Henry's book, entitled, the "Erudition of a Christian Man;" but which are not to be found in the writings of our reformers, during the far more protestant days of king Edward. It was the opinion of bishop Gardiner, who espoused the doctrine of king Henry's book, that the views of faith and justification there given, were in direct contradiction to those stated in the homilies written by Cranmer after Henry's death: nor was the fact denied by Cranmer. We refer our readers for proof of this position to p. 107. A very singular coincidence is observable between the expressions respecting faith and works, in Gardiner's letter to Cranmer which is there referred to, and those which are to be found in some of Mr. D.'s pages on the same subject. Now Gardiner *avowedly* opposed Cranmer's views of faith. Since therefore it can be shewn that Mr. D. agrees with Gardiner, it will be a difficult task to reconcile his opinions with those of Cranmer and his brother reformers. But, notwithstanding the extreme incorrectness of some of Mr. D.'s representations, such is the inadequate state of general information on most of the points which are here discussed, and such is the tone of confidence, and even of triumph, with which Mr. D. exposes the alleged errors of his opponent, that many, we doubt not, will be led to conclude that his publication is decisive of the question at issue. Enough has already been said to shew, that this would be a very hasty and unfounded conclusion; and that Mr. D. is little fitted, either by the extent and accuracy of his knowledge, or by his freedom from passion and prejudice, to act the part of an arbiter in the present controversy.

\* Some, however, of the errors of Mr. D. are of a nature which scarcely admits of their being regarded as proceeding merely from a want of acquaintance with the subject, or as the mere effect of prejudice or irritation. For these sources of error some allowance may fairly be claimed; and, in the present instance, we feel fully disposed to admit the claim. But when Mr. D. represents bishop Cleaver as maintaining the *Non-calvinism* of Nowell's Catechism; although that prelate has distinctly admitted it to be Calvinistic: when, by the reiterated omission of an emphatic NOT in an extract from the homilies, he attributes to our reformers sentiments directly the reverse of what they entertained: when he refers to Strype as his authority for asserting that Bradford's Treatise on Election did not obtain the sanction of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer; although Strype affirms that it did obtain their approbation: when he quotes the same author to prove, that our reformers did not employ Calvin as their counsel; although that annalist distinctly states that Cranmer did apply to Calvin for counsel: when he adduces the preface to archbishop Parker's Bible, as furnishing decisive evidence of the designed exclusion of Calvinism from the church; although the notes to that Bible, as well as the catechism which is inserted in it, are in the highest degree Calvin-

istic : and when, in opposition to all existing testimony, he contends that king James, and the English delegates to the synod of Dort, preferred the sentiments of Arminius to those of Calvin : we must profess ourselves unable to frame any probable hypothesis, which, without derogating from Mr. Daubeny's character for ingenuousness, will account for such errors. We can scarcely suppose them to be merely the result of inadvertence, or of ordinary prejudice, but either of some cause which remains to be explained, or of prejudice the most extraordinary.' p. 129.

With regard to the first paragraph in this extract, we shall only remark that, whereas it is observed that 'Mr. Daubeny, *as has been already shewn*, adheres to those views of faith and justification which are to be found in king Henry's book,'—'that a very singular coincidence is observable between Gardiner's letter, Harding's reply, and Mr. Daubeny's pages,'—the evidence of the truth of these assertions is not so fully laid before us, as to carry any great satisfaction to our minds along with it. It consists of a few short expressions from Gardiner ; but there is nothing produced from Harding, nor any thing from Mr. Daubeny, by the comparison of which the resemblance might be ascertained. And yet upon so slender and slovenly a proof Mr. D. is to bear all the prejudice and the odium which may be brought upon him by the charge of symbolizing with papists.

The next paragraph makes us cry out with the poet :

'O rus ! quando ego te aspiciam ? quandoque licebit  
Nunc veterum libris, nunc somno et inertibus horis,  
Ducere sollicitæ jucunda obliviam vitæ ?'

Upon summing up the account, we see that there are six principal matters contained in it, and they are all important errors. We do not mean that they are all errors belonging to the Candid Examiner ; nor yet, notwithstanding the confident assertions of that writer, are they all errors of Mr. Daubeny. The two gentlemen, we believe, divide the blame pretty equally between them. But what we wish to observe is, that the public is the sufferer ; that the six errors, whencesoever they may have come, have been let loose to roam abroad, and to do their work of evil. It is our earnest desire, that if such facts will not make authors more circumspect, they may produce in readers a determination to have nothing to do with such controversialists, to leave them to fight it out by themselves, or at least may generate a salutary distrust and caution in the reception of their authorities and arguments.

The first two errors, we believe, are Mr. Daubeny's ; the next, which is much more involved and cumulative, belongs

to the Candid Examiner. To adjust this matter fairly, we must transcribe the whole account which is given of it, in the part of his work to which we are referred :

‘ Mr. D. quotes Strype in support of his opinion of the non-acceptance of Bradford’s Treatise on Election, by Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, (P. 412.) On looking into Strype, however, we find his language to be directly contrary to what Mr. D. attributes to him. We confess ourselves utterly at a loss to account for such a “palpable misrepresentation.” It may be worth while to lay before our readers the whole transaction as recorded by Strype in his Life of Cranmer, P. 350.

“ One thing there now fell out which caused some disturbance among the prisoners. Many of them that were under restraint for the profession of the gospel were such as held free-will, tending to the derogation of God’s grace, and refused the doctrine of absolute predestination and original sin.”—“ Divers of them were in the King’s-bench, where Bradford and many other gospellers were.”—“ Bradford was apprehensive that they might now do great harm in the church, and therefore wrote a letter to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, the three chief heads of the reformed (though oppressed) church in England, to take some cognizance of this matter, and to consult with them in remedying it. And with him joined bishop Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and John Philpot. Upon this occasion Ridley wrote a treatise of *God’s election and predestination*. And Bradford wrote another upon the same subject, and sent it to those three fathers, in Oxford, for their approbation: and THEIRS BEING OBTAINED, *the rest of the eminent ministers in and about London were ready to sign it also.*” Strype’s Life of Cranmer, P. 350.

‘ Now Mr. D.’s words, in referring to this transaction, are, that Bradford “wrote a treatise on God’s election, and sent it to the bishops Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, when confined at Oxford, for their approbation. But the circumstance of this treatise having been *entirely suppressed* by Bradford, *authorizes the conclusion that it did NOT obtain the sanction of the venerable martyrs.*”’ P. 109.

By his italics and uncials (which are favourite figures of speech in the Calvinistical controversy), and by his affirming that ‘the language of Strype is directly contrary to what Mr. D. attributes to him,’ it is plain in what way the Candid Examiner has misinterpreted the honest historian. The misinterpretation is far from being new; it has been often already before the public: it lies now before us, in another pamphlet, in more authoritative uncials even than those of Mr. Gosnell; and the Candid Examiner, we doubt not, has fallen into the pit by following his predecessors. The clause in Strype, which is clearly *conditional*, these writers are determined to understand as *affirmative*. The testimony means no more than that, if the approbation or signatures of Cran-

mer, Ridley, and Latimer, were first obtained, the rest were ready to sign it also. Turn to the letter itself in Strype's appendix (p. 195), and it is plain that we have stated the true meaning: 'Al the prisoners here about in maner have seen it, and read it: and as therein they aggre with me, nay rather with the truth, so they *are ready and wil be*, to signify it, as they *shal se you give them example*.' There is exceedingly strong evidence to prove that Bradford's treatise did not obtain the desired sanction of Cranmer, &c. Our readers may find a taste of it in Dr. Ridley's life of his great namesake, (p. 549, &c.); and it has been very well enlarged upon by Dr. Winchester, in his Dissertation on the Seventeenth Article (p. 67-77, new edit.) We have investigated the subject ourselves, independently of either of these authorities, and our conclusions are correspondent with theirs. We prefer, however, the rather to refer to them, that our readers may know, that, not only, as we have observed, is the Examiner's interpretation an *old* one, but that this is by no means the first occasion on which a much correcter estimate of this subject than that in the Candid Examination has been delivered to the public.

Whether the Candid Examiner had indeed the identical treatise which was transmitted to bishop Ridley, 'before his eyes, at the moment when he was writing,' we shall not presume either to affirm or to deny. Dr. Winchester tells us, 'that after the most diligent search, he never could learn that it was in print, or preserved in manuscript.' (Dissertat. p. 68.) The doctor was not a novice in these inquiries; we are inclined therefore to think it possible, that he was of opinion that this treatise was a different one from that gathered out of the first chapter to the Ephesians, and from the other two on the same argument, in the volume which lay so opportunely before the eyes of the Candid Examiner. For otherwise we can hardly explain how, 'after the most diligent search,' an inquirer like Dr. Winchester should never have heard of the volume of Bradford's Meditations. It is by no means a very scarce book. The Candid Examiner tells us of his edition of 1614. 'Before *our eyes*' there is at this moment an edition of the year 1604: and we perused some time ago the *ancient* original edition, but its date we are unable to communicate. It may be worth while to mention, that, if we remember aright, the author of the Life of Bradford in the Biographia Britannica affirms that a manuscript of this treatise is still extant in the Bodleian library. If this information be correct, perhaps something might be collected from that MS. which it would be a service to communicate to the public.



It is certainly true that Cranmer did, and that Strype tells us that Cranmer did, apply to Calvin for counsel. In this particular, therefore, we have nothing to say in behalf of Mr. Daubeny. We shall remark further, and by the way, that we assent to the interpretation which this writer has given in another part of his book, of the 'tolerabiles ineptiæ' of Calvin when speaking of the English liturgy. But if the Examiner means to go further, and to infer that Calvin's authority with Cranmer was equal to that of Melancthon, or that his influence was powerful in the conduct of the English Reformation, or that the observations of those writers are to be despised who deny this to have been the case, we then beg leave to quit the Examiner, and to pass over to the other side.

To explain more clearly what we have to say upon the next particular, we must once more transcribe from the Examiner the passage to which he has referred us :

“ Mr. D. considers a similar extract from archbishop Parker's preface to the Bible, and which stands precisely on the same footing, to be declarative of a design on the part of the governors of our church to exclude the Calvinistic doctrine of election (p. 420). But how, we would ask, will Mr. Daubeny reconcile this deduction with the fact that in the same volume was inserted, under the same authority, viz. that of the archbishops and bishops of the church of England, the well-known Calvinistic catechism, entitled, “ Certain Questions and Answers touching the Doctrine of Predestination, the Use of God's Word and Sacraments ? ” In this catechism Mr. Daubeny must know, that not only the doctrine of election, but that of reprobation also, is plainly and explicitly affirmed and defended. Or how will Mr. Daubeny reconcile the above reasoning with the Calvinistic language contained in the notes to the same Bible, and which, we are told by Strype, were done by the bishops, but chiefly by the archbishops? (Life of Parker, p. 400.) Let the reader only turn to the notes on Ezek. xviii. 23. Rom. ix. 11. and xi. 35. 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Pet. i. 10. Matt. xi. 26. and xxv. 34. John, xvii. 12. *cum multis aliis*; and he will see the force of this question. And yet from some general expressions in the preface to this very work, expressions to which no sublapsarian Calvinist has ever objected, Mr. Daubeny argues in favour of the *designed exclusion* of Calvinism from the church of England. Or how will he reconcile with his statement the following words in the preface to the New Testament, written by the archbishop himself? (See App. to Strype's Parker, No. 84.) “ By him hath he decreed to give to his elect the life everlasting; and to the reprobate, who hath contemned his life and doctrine, death everlasting.” These words may, no doubt, be interpreted in an Anti-calvinistic sense: but are they such as an Arminian would have chosen ? ” p. 113.

But, what now if this ‘ well-known Calvinistic catechism ’

to which we are so triumphantly referred, had never any existence in the Bible of the archbishops and bishops? If it was ever at any moment before the eyes of the Candid Examiner, he must have been poring in the Genevan, and not in the episcopal Bible. We have looked into a good many Bishops' Bibles, but we never saw any Calvinistic catechism there. But that we may characterize more completely the want of care, the want of learning, the want of circumspection, the blind traditional reception and propagation of errors, of which we have so much reason to complain, we choose to derive the detection of these errors from materials which are already before the public, rather than to acquiesce in our own investigations, or to take to ourselves the credit of their exposure.

In Mr. Churton's biographical preface to the second edition of Dr. Winchester's Dissertation on the Seventeenth Article, it is said :

'The rude attack made upon the church of England by the author of the Confessional, and, about the same time, by the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*, could not be disregarded by one so steadily attached to that church as Dr. Winchester; and his remarks on those productions, though he did not publish any thing on the occasion in his own name, were serviceable to his friends, and to the cause of truth. In Dr. Nowell's answer to *Pietas Oxoniensis*, second edition, 1769, Dr. Winchester is the "very judicious friend" mentioned in the note, page 106, as "well acquainted with the several editions of the Bible, and the occasions of them;" and he there shews that "the questions and answers concerning predestination," which are inserted in some editions of the Geneva Bible,\* and were said by the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis* † to have been "*always* printed at the end of the Old Testament, and bound up with this authorized translation of the Bible (meaning the Bishops' Bible), till about the year 1615," were probably "*never* bound up with that Bible: nor indeed could they with any consistency appear there; for archbishop Parker, the great promoter of this translation, in his preface

---

\* By a paper of Dr. Winchester's, now in my hands, on this subject, he appears to have examined fourteen editions of the Geneva Bible, from 1560 to 1616; of which not more than three or four (one of them being imperfect) had these questions and answers; and four editions of the Bishops' Bible, none of which had them; and he observes in Nowell (*loc. citat.*) that Lewis (*Hist. of Transl. of Bible*, p. 235-264) mentions eight editions of the Bishops' Bible, and takes no notice of these questions being printed with them, though he is very particular in giving the contents of them, and takes particular notice when they were inserted (1583) in the Geneva Bible.

† Here then is one predecessor of the Candid Examiner. If our readers refer to about page 490 of Mr. Toplady's *Historic Proof*, if we mistake not they will find another. REV.

asserts the direct opposite to the third question and answer," namely, universal redemption: "Search the scriptures, &c. (John v. 39.) No man, woman, or childe, is excluded from this salvation, and therefore to every of them is this spoken." (P. x. xi.)

The synod of Dort, king James, and his delegates, are so far removed from the sphere of the Réformation, that we really cannot bring ourselves to take any trouble about them: and not having Mr. Daubeny's work in our possession, we are less qualified to estimate correctly to what extent his alleged mis-statements in this particular may have proceeded.

Thus have we laid before our readers some portion of the observations which have occurred to us during a perusal of the *Candid Examination*. We have endeavoured to make them useful in some degree to the author of that work, to Mr. Daubeny, and above all, as our duty requires, to the public. We have no taste for this controversy; and should be glad to find that it was over. However, till the time shall come when the zeal of the combatants shall subside of itself, or shall be silenced by the public voice, we shall, we trust, be present at our post, to plead with all our might the cause of moderation and christian charity, to detect misrepresentation, to rebuke intolerance, and ever to sound in the ears of the contending parties the words of the patriarchal expostulation, 'Sirs! ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?'

---

ART. VI.—*Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy.* (Concluded from page 94.)

THIS volume contains twelve articles; eight on miscellaneous subjects, three on what is denominated polite literature, and one on antiquities. Of those under the former of these heads, five were noticed in our last number; we now proceed to the examination of the remainder.

Art. 2. 'Account of the Whynn Dykes in the Neighbourhood of the Giant's Causeway, Ballycastle, and Belfast; in a Letter to the Lord Bishop of Dromore, from William Richardson, D. D. late Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.'—This letter, in Dr. Richardson's classical phrase, is occupied with the consideration of basalt subjects. Residing in the immediate vicinity of these dykes, he has had a ready opportunity of making himself familiar with the mineralogical face of that part of Ireland. Observations of this sort must always prove valuable in a certain degree. Every philosopher deserves well of science who brings new facts to the formerly collected mass, and who adds another line to the picture of

nature which it is the universal aim to complete. But he must carry along with him to this labour an observant and active mind, a body of which the senses are acute, industry unwearied, and above all a philosophical freedom from prejudice. Dr. Richardson is too modest to claim the former of these requisites, but he insinuates in no indistinct terms his possession of the latter, which however it is impossible to concede to him. That he is no Huttonian we readily grant. Perhaps it would be difficult to name any sect to which he precisely belongs. But he certainly is an anti-Huttonian, and pursues that theory through every twig of its ramifications, with an hostility that never arose in the regions of science. We do not pretend to point out its source, but it resembles more the ill-nature of contending sectaries than the sober disputation of lovers of philosophical truth. Dr. Richardson has studied Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and the other worthies of antiquity, with peculiar and happy care, and has discovered in these authors an unknown mine of mineralogical knowledge. The Horatian maxim, *ridiculum aere*, seems to have inspired his whole soul; and with never-ceasing efforts he bespatters his opponents with opportune quotations to be found in the mouth of every school-boy. These triumphant essays of wit seem to us very little deserving of the place they hold. Even good jokes are bad arguments in mineralogy: but heaven defend us from the cant of common-place quotation!

This letter is in a great measure however occupied with the detail of facts. There is a second letter, which will be considered in its place, where more regard is paid to theory. In the Hebrides it appears that whynn dykes in general rise above the ground, and often serve for fences, whence their name. With a steady course they ascend and descend mountains, cross rivers and seas, still adhering to their original direction. In the north of Ireland, however, they sometimes appear in the faces of the perpendicular precipices, where they are seen cutting vertically the several strata of which these are composed, and burying themselves in the northern ocean. In the Hebrides Dr. Richardson is surprised at the incredible length to which these walls run. In Ireland he only observes the effect, or non-effect rather, at the point of their contact with the different materials which they meet. With the accuracy of his country, the doctor quotes an account of the island of Lismore, which, he says, 'is *entirely* limestone, but contains *some* whynn dykes.' At this place, and frequently elsewhere, he refutes the frail arguments of the volcanists, who believe basalt to be an ancient lava.

This paper, consisting chiefly of an account of phenomena observed by Dr. Richardson, does not admit of advantageous

abridgment. It is only occasionally that we can notice its contents. Those who wish for precise information of the doctor's views, will do well to consult the original, which is illustrated with some good sketches of the faces of basaltic precipices. We do not think Dr. Richardson's ideas upon basalt are very precise; at least some of the specimens which the Irish naturalists consider as basaltic, and from which they draw arguments to confute their igneous opponents, are denied by the British mineralogists to belong to that class of bodies. In this contested mineral are found marine exuviae. But granting its basaltic nature, Mr. Playfair has afforded an explanation of their origin, concerning which it does not appear that Dr. Richardson has afforded any relevant observations or arguments of any sort in the first letter. Dr. Richardson does not seem to vary, in his ideas of candour and freedom from system, from most other philosophers. Our readers will please to be informed that these expressions mean prejudice and attachment to the theory which is adopted by the writer of the remarks. Surely never was language so misapplied as when Mr. Jameson is complimented upon his freedom from system.

In the course of these observations an enquiry is instituted on the question, whether the Scotch whynn dykes originated in Ireland. This reminds us of another dispute between these two antediluvian countries, concerning the original source of population. The Irish will have the Scotch to be their progeny; the Scotch are not a whit less clear that from their nation sprung the ancestors of the Irish. Here it appears is another bone of contention: from which country do these dykes arise? The dykes, it is true, are of no value; their origin is of no consequence. But then there is the honour, and honour is too nice a thing to comprehend such hair-spun distinctions.

In the latter part of this letter the reverend doctor leaves his original solid course of facts, to wrestle in the bowels of the earth with the volcanists and the Plutonists, commanded by the redoubtable doctors Hamilton and Hutton. After granting to these gentlemen some of their ground-work, he proceeds to confute them on their own principles: a favourite and triumphant method of vanquishing an enemy, but exposing him who attempts it to the risk of a conspicuous defeat. Dr. Richardson first states that many contiguous dykes differ from each other, yet by both theories they must have been formed of the same materials. This is not the first instance by a good many, nor the last by a great many, where we may observe and lament a deficiency of chemical knowledge in this gentleman's writings. It has been long well



known that slight and apparently trifling differences in the mode of combining or treating chemical agents render the results materially various. The ingenious experiments of sir James Hall have demonstrated that fluid basalt suddenly cooled is glass, but slowly refrigerated becomes of a stony texture. Some other facts of a similar nature shall be noticed in the course of our strictures on these letters. But surely the bare mention of these experiments is amply sufficient to detect the fallacy of this argument.

Dr. Richardson's second proposition is, that many dykes shew a material difference between their sides and middle parts, which changes are sudden or *per saltum*. These circumstances are asserted to be incompatible with the high state of fluidity in which the basalt must have been. To this argument we might again oppose the authority of sir James Hall. But it is still more satisfactorily accounted for and admirably illustrated in a paper to be found in the Philosophical Transactions of London, by Mr. Gregory Watt, for whose untimely fate every lover of science must feel the deepest and best-founded regret. From that specimen of his active talents, that elegant blossom of the spring of his existence, we may guess what might have been the full-blown flower of his summer, and the ripened fruit of his autumnal years. After a perusal and consideration of the experiments and reasoning to which we allude, with the inferences to which they plainly lead, Dr. Richardson will hardly repeat an objection so well answered.

The third argument against the volcanists and Plutonists is, that whynn dykes do not produce upon contiguous strata the effect reasonably to be looked for from the contiguity of so glowing a mass. Dr. Hutton, it is well understood, did not regard this objection with peculiar veneration. He denied the proposition, and asserted that every effect was produced which could possibly have been expected in the circumstances. Not to be sure such as would have happened in the open fire, but here the heat was applied in a situation where an immense compression resisted the rarefaction of elastic fluids. The observation of every succeeding writer against the Huttonian theory, has confirmed the justice of the remark invidiously distinguished by Dr. Richardson in *Italic characters*, that 'to understand how bodies containing elastic substances may be fused without suffering calcination, requires a chain of reasoning which every one is not able to comprehend.' We sincerely believe that it was not without a due sense of the propriety of his conduct that Dr. Richardson used these same *Italics*. But it is devoutly to be hoped that the comprehension of the reverend divine may have received some illumination

from the recent experiments of the indefatigable and ingenious sir James Hall, who has shown, nay demonstrated, that chalk, horn, and coal, may be readily fused under compression without parting with any of their elastic matter; thus confirming the sagacious conjecture of Hutton by the unanswerable evidence of facts, and driving cavilers and non-comprehenders from one of the posts where they have so long and so vainly endeavoured to maintain themselves.

From this, however, Dr. Richardson flies to another branch of the argument; and triumphantly demands why this should happen on the surface of the earth where the dykes are so often found, even granting for a moment that compression had really acted this part in the internal regions of the globe. Now before proceeding half a footstep in this path, we require Dr. Richardson to prove that these dykes now meeting the strata in the face of day, were really erupted to the surface on their original formation. Dr. Hutton, we know, imagined all this to happen for the most part at considerable depths, and that the superincumbent substances have been long since removed by the progress of decay, and the ever-wasting descent of rains and of rivers.

The last argument adduced in this letter is, that since all substances when ignited are in a high state of dilatation, their cooling should be accompanied by a contraction which ought to cause chasms or cracks. Now though it be granted that cracks should occur, yet surely it is most unreasonable to expect them at every yard or small distance. On the great scale they will occur differently from the rending of a small mass cooling; and Dr. Richardson, when he descends into the bowels of the earth, will find enough of rents and of cavities. Even by his own account of basalts, their substance is by no means continuous in every place; besides, many cavities and rents and fissures which may have formerly existed, may be supposed even by the Plutonic theory to have been since filled up by percolation and other accidents. For though the agency of water will not alone account for the phenomena of geology, the silent operation of some thousand years may be supposed to have effected several of the minuter alterations in the circumstances of the strata.

Notwithstanding these remarks, there will be found many valuable and interesting observations in this letter, which ought to serve as a stimulus to the industry of succeeding travellers, some of whom it is to be hoped will verify or correct the accounts of Dr. Richardson. We do not wish to conceal that we should desire to see brought to such an undertaking a more ample store of mineralogical knowledge, a better acquaintance with geological facts, some additional che-

mical information, and a mind unbiassed either by preconceived opinions, or the unjust fear of lighting upon something unfavourable to more serious views. Yet we are far from wishing to undervalue the labours of this reverend gentleman, a repetition of whose communications we shall with pleasure perceive.

Art. 5. 'Journal of the Thermometer, Hygrometer, Barometer, Winds, and Rain, kept at Windsor, Nova Scotia, by the Reverend W. Cochrane, President of King's College.. Communicated by the Reverend Dr. Kearney, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.'—This journal comprehends a period of three years, from January 1794 to January 1797. Such numerical details are not the fit subjects of criticism. We must approve the industry, and presume the accuracy, of the compilation. By a hasty glance, for we pretend not to have referred to every number, we have observed the climate of New Scotland to be very variable in the winter months. The observations being made always at noon, no very great colds are noted. We have noticed nothing lower than one degree above zero. January is the coldest month according to this statement. The quantity of rain is given not daily, but only occasionally. By adding up the sums in 1794, there appears to have fallen 24.245 inches. The following table shows the monthly allotment of the rain that year, and the two succeeding :

	Inches of Rain. 1794.	1795.	1796.
January	2.148	1.275	.906
February	.343	.906	1.777
March	2.679	1.580	.522
April	.944	3.054	.602
May	3.141	4.489	2.138
June	2.559	2.938	4.228
July	1.398	.754	3.677
August	2.231	3.188	.870
September	1.410	3.136	4.384
October	2.275	3.441	3.985
November	2.131	2.078	3.360
December	1.986	2.170	0.000
Whole rain	24.245	29.009	26.441

The mean quantity amounts to 26.565 inches. The formation of such tables as the above, by which the whole information contained in the journal is perceived at one view, ought to be the care of every observer, not left to the critic to per-

form. But the taste for the observation of such facts appears to have little tendency to stimulate the mind to the deduction of general conclusions. It is a little extraordinary that no rain at all should have fallen in December 1796, a month generally plentifully supplied with moisture. If Mr. Cochrane shall continue his labours, we recommend it to him to form a table somewhat on the plan of the above, to which however ought to be added the mean height of the thermometer and of the barometer for every month and for every year. The trouble of this is to the observer as nothing, and is alleviated and rewarded by the satisfaction of working upon his own materials. With others the case is different; most people will rather want the information altogether than be at the trouble of so tedious and fatiguing a process to find it out. Curiosity and indolence, two great powers of the human mind, for ever oppose each other's advances, but to the latter for the greater part is to be attributed the honour of the day.

Art. 7. 'Inquiry into the Consistency of Dr. Hutton's Theory of the Earth, with the Arrangement of the Strata and other Phenomena on the Basaltic Coast of Antrim. By the Rev. William Richardson, D. D.'—This letter, composed upon a similar subject with that already noticed, contains however proportionally little actual observation and much theoretical discussion. To theories of every sort Dr. Richardson is peculiarly hostile, as if every thing that is valuable in human knowledge were not the deduction of general principles from connected facts, that very theorising which is here deprecated. That many theories are ill-founded, is too plain a truth to bear a denial; yet to the worst theory of any kind of repute we do not hesitate to affirm that science owes more than to any empiric whatever. In order to demonstrate the falsehood of any such proposition as is alluded to, the whole store of facts is ransacked, every principle is investigated, and the minds of men are sharpened and stimulated by the defence and by the attack. A slavish deference to the opinion of others is as contemptible as it is prejudicial. But all that is attractive and delightful in human science, all that gratifies the mind or stimulates the industry of men, is comprehended under the name of theory. We shall ever receive more pleasure from the particular refutation than from the general blame of hypotheses. From the former we shall expect the improvement and extension of knowledge; from the latter no better fruits than rancour and ill-will, with the discouragement of all liberal pursuits.

That the progress of natural history should have appeared for a long time less rapid than that of the other branches of science, is to be attributed only to the preference of mankind

for the latter. Yet we doubt very much whether these advances were proportionally so small as is imagined. As knowledge increases, those elementary observations which once were accounted profound and important come to be ranked with self-evident or obvious propositions. The truth is, that all the arguments against theories apply to their abuse only.

Dr. Richardson, after noticing the celebrated but doubtful antichristian conspiracy on the continent, to confute the arguments of our religion, coldly and ambiguously exculpates Hutton from a share in it. Leaving to others the consideration of Dr. Hutton's arguments *a priori*, Dr. Richardson selects for himself the comparison of his doctrines with the state of facts, and examines the claim which this theory has set up of being proved *a posteriori*. Whatever doubt may now be entertained of the existence of any thing resembling a regular antichristian plot, Dr. Richardson seems to be totally free from such scepticism, and in return conspires in a most violent manner against the Plutonists, disregarding of the steady denial of any irreligious motives both by the founder of this theory and his principal defenders.

Before proceeding to the grand attack, the doctor aims a side blow at Mr. Brydone, whose arguments for the antiquity of the world were drawn from the observation of successive strata of lava with interposed vegetable mould. This mould requiring a considerable period for its formation according to that writer, gives the means of computing the distance of time between the flow of the different beds of lava. We believe it is Mr. Bryan Hill who has satisfactorily shown that one of Mr. Brydone's principal positions is false, and that the mould may be formed in a much shorter time than he imagined. Dr. Richardson gives another account of this matter, and conceives that the supposed beds of lava are really basalt. This supposition is by no means improbable, the resemblance between these two bodies being frequently sufficient to deceive even an accurate mineralogical observer, to which character we believe Mr. Brydone had little claim. His reasonings upon the existence of the earth are certainly wrong in themselves, and are introduced with peculiar impropriety into a work of a popular and amusing kind, as if to entrap the unwary into the perusal of arguments, at the bare mention of which they would otherwise have shuddered.

Dr. Richardson proceeds, after settling this business to his satisfaction, to deal about his sarcasms and jokes in every direction, till a sort of smothered indignation appears at Dr. Hutton's declaration that the result of his enquiry is, that he finds no vestige of a beginning, no prospect of an end. That is, that in the natural or physical phenomena of the earth, no



such vestiges are to be found. He is far from saying that the world has had no beginning, or that it will have no end. But he asserts that the evidence for such events cannot be drawn from the consideration of the strata and other appearances of this globe. He would be a bold arguer indeed who should affirm that any natural phenomena could support such propositions. The proof of the exact duration of the earth's existence and of its ultimate destruction, is to be sought in other pages than those of the book of nature: it is to be sought, where only it can be found, in those inspired writings to which alone every well-grounded believer must refer for the origin, and for the support, of his opinions. Dr. Richardson, however, in no very ambiguous language declares his belief, that whatever Dr. Hutton's intentions may have been, the tendency of his doctrines is antichristian. It must surely require an unusual muddiness of understanding to be unable to discern the difference of the two propositions under consideration: between the atheistical assertion that the world has had no beginning, and will have no end; and the Huttonian conclusion that in the natural appearances of the earth we find no vestige of a beginning, and no prospect of an end. With an untasteful change of attack, the doctor abandons his logical weapons, to dart the shafts of wit, and launch forth popular and puny jokes. To prove the antiquity of the theory, he gives a specimen of his knowledge of Greek by quoting Lucian on the opinions of Heraclitus, and of his credulity by a passage from Barruel on the illuminati. He supports the candour of his arguments by the authority of the jesuits of the Sorbonne, and liberally compares the intentions of Hutton to the open infidelity of D'Alembert. What connection the credibility of Moses has with the Plutonic theory of the earth, we know not. Were not this place ill adapted for a theological discussion, we are not afraid that we should be unable to shew this theory to be in no respect inconsistent with the scriptural account of the first ages of the world.

After perambulating for some pages through mazes of invective and quotations, Dr. Richardson at last finds out that he is wandering from his subject; and returns, greatly to our satisfaction, to Dr. Hutton's theory, which he considers under three divisions. The first of these is the proposition that the materials of the world are in constant motion from its higher parts to the unfathomable regions of the ocean, where they are deposited in strata horizontal or nearly so. Before entering deeply into the consideration of this argument, Dr. Richardson enters a caveat against admitting the truth of any of Hutton's positions, which he asserts are often slipped in almost incidentally. Dr. Richardson will by no means allow of

the apparent disorder or confusion in the solid tracts of the globe. The reason of this denial is curious enough. This gentleman, it seems, has examined about thirty-five miles of country in Ireland where the strata are horizontal, or approaching to that position. From such a local and unusual observation to draw a general conclusion, is wholly unphilosophical. Granting that all the strata now on the surface have been raised by violence from the bottom of the ocean, it cannot surely appear singular that here and there a small district like the scene of the doctor's observations, should have been raised with little disturbance of the strata. Arguments drawn from such very local occurrences, cannot bear a general conclusion.

But the doctor is peculiarly eager to prove that there is nothing in nature like a descent of the materials of the world, from a higher to a lower part. He contends that the stratum of soil covered with vegetables prevents this waste. It is certainly true that almost all the surface of the earth is more or less covered with such a coat. It is not however all so, and in many places this coat is at least very threadbare. We cannot answer for the doctor's 'own native isle of the ocean' in this respect; but we are very sure that this island, as well as many other parts of the world, are not supplied with this green clothing so as to prevent the action of the air and rain upon the earthy matters. There are two ways of arguing this point. We may discuss the probability of the waste of soil, and make our observations of the fact; or we may leave that branch of the argument, and content ourselves with proving that the rivers do really carry down with them in their course variously-sized fragments of the globe. The utmost therefore that can be argued from the existence of the vegetable garment is, that this process goes on somewhat less rapidly than it would otherwise do. The immediate contact of the air is not necessary for the decay of the stony materials of the world. We have ourselves often observed this progress of destruction advancing at considerable depths under the surface of the ground, and this in the hard and compact masses of granite and basalt. Mr. Richardson himself admits that the trappe on the high grounds and mountains are for half an inch within the surface somewhat less sound, and vary a little in colour from the interior of the soil; that is, that they are decaying. Many rocks are absolutely bare, and from them the small particles of crumbled stone are washed away soon after the decomposition. The lichens and mosses may detain the first portions; but their thin and scanty vegetation cannot retain the accumulating soil. This process of decay, so obvious over the entire surface of the globe, pursues the follow-

ing course on the lower grounds. The upper stratum, being partially rotted, receives the roots of vegetables, affording them support, and perhaps part of their nourishment. In time this earthy substance is mingled with the carbonic remains of dead plants and animals, and a soil is formed. Every heavy shower washes away part of this mixture, sparing neither of the materials. It would indeed be wonderful if rain had the power of separating the remains of the organised from those of the unorganised bodies. The first shower carries its load only a short way, depositing it on the banks or in the channel of some of the minor streams. By successive repetitions of this process, these powdery and light substances are carried into the sea, where we may observe the turbid river commingling its foul waters with the pure and transparent ocean.

Dr. Richardson seems very unnecessarily anxious to multiply the instances where no decay takes place under our actual observation. It would be easy to point out the Egyptian pyramids and many other monuments of antiquity, which if they have decayed have at least decayed very slowly. As Dr. Hutton's theory is in no respect limited to any particular period of time in which it must perform its operations, it is sufficient for him to prove that decay takes place at all. But we are tempted to smile at the cargo of coals in Mr. Hodgson Gage's garden, which the doctor seems to have expected to have taken legs to itself and to have walked off in a body.

The main position, however, which the Huttonians must contest, and which they will not contest without success, is that the materials carried off by rivers are not all organised remains. On this indeed the whole of the doctor's arguments rest. For if it be proved that earthy matters are carried off, the former discussion where he attempted to show that none could be carried off, is worth nothing. Now we refer to any person who will be at the trouble to examine the mud brought down by any river large or small during a flood, whether it contains earthy matters or not. There is no need to deny that it frequently also contains vegetable substances. But the main part is of a siliceous and aluminous kind as clearly as any thing can be. To say nothing of the larger masses of stones which are gradually rolled along, and water-worn by the operation of the stream.

The decomposition of basalt rocks is reluctantly admitted by Dr. Richardson. He confesses that a crust is formed over their surface; that the angles are blunted; that the articulations suffer a little; and that the points or pyramids which ascend from the lower joint often fall down. Yet he asserts that the pillars seem to preserve their ancient diameter: contracting his ideas thus to the narrow circle of his own vision,

and because heaven has shortened his days to a span, refusing to imagine the undying operations of the universe. We cannot divine by what admeasurement the doctor has become so very certain of the permanence of all these diameters.

There follows to this passage a consideration of the probability of the formation of valleys by water, and a most pertinacious miscomprehension of Dr. Hutton's opinions. What can be more futile when marks of the action of rivers are imagined to be perceived on high mountains, than to say in order to confute that theory, that if rivers have run there they must have run up one side and down another? thus totally putting out of view the former suppositions of a waste of land already to an immense extent. A valley may certainly have been formed by a rivulet which does not now run from the very superior part of it; or in other words, the valley may begin before the rivulet in such a case. The knowledge of the exact spot where the mud of rivers is deposited shown by Dr. Richardson, is really surprising; and as no arguments are given for such an arrangement, we imagine his confidence must have arisen from a submarine excursion. There could be nothing at all contradictory to the doctor's own principles in *his* being carried even into the deepest parts of the ocean, as his arguments deny only to the materials of the world such a voyage, but allow all sorts of liberties to animal and vegetable remains.

Not satisfied with this confutation, Dr. Richardson attacks this first proposition *a posteriori*. To these posteriors this gentleman indeed seems to adhere with the partiality of a pedagogue. He is of opinion that if Dr. Hutton's account were true, there should be formed at the bottom of the sea a mass entirely uniform, no distinction of strata in a vertical direction, nor change of the materials in an horizontal one. The observation upon vertical strata shews a complete miscomprehension of the theory in question. Dr. Hutton never supposed them to be formed in such a position. As to the rest of this passage, for any thing we see the same arguments apply to the strata formed by rivers near their own beds under our actual inspection. Nay more, for the materials should be still more nearly homogeneous coming more nearly from one source. But are the strata on that account more nearly resemblative of each other? Do sections of the strata formed by the Rhine show a mass completely uniform, are there vertical strata, and is there no change of materials in an horizontal direction? Dr. Richardson ought to know how to answer these questions with truth.

With the variety of minute objections detailed under this head, we will not fatigue our readers: they may all be readily

answered, and can require no criticism to any person well-grounded in the Huttonian theory.

Proceeding therefore along with our author, we arrive at the second proposition to be considered, 'that our strata were consolidated at the bottom of the sea by heat and fusion.' It certainly sounds very Hibernian to say that strata are made solid by melting them, and we should have chosen a form of expression a little different. Taking it as we find it, however, we go on to examine the doctor's arguments. Of course he grants the points disputed under the last head. This proposition of Dr. Hutton's is certainly much more difficult of proof than the former. The scene of action is totally removed from human ken. There appears every reason to think that the strata have undergone the action of heat, and have afterwards been lifted from their position. But it is an arduous task to pretend to describe the particular circumstances of the operation. Instead of saying that this consolidation happened at the bottom, Dr. Richardson should have said that it happened under the bottom of the ocean, with which modification of language he would have found no embarrassment from the meeting of the fire and water. It would be absurd indeed to imagine that any mineral substance could be either melted or consolidated in contact with the water of the ocean. After such consolidation, water should not be found in stones unless it afterwards found access to them, and this we imagine to have been the case in those instances quoted by Dr. Richardson.

The absence of rents in the strata examined for thirty miles along the Irish coast, we suppose a Huttonian would not much regard while so many instances of such fissures are to be found in all mines. But it is to be observed that no account is taken of the whynn dykes which Hutton supposed frequently to fill up such rents. The objections to this do not strike us as valid; we shall not however return to the consideration of these dykes. Perhaps the uniform thickness of such rents may be accounted for on the supposition that all the strata adhering strongly during contraction, those which separated most, if at the same time of the firmest texture, might force the less contractile to follow them, while the fluid basalt might sweep away any accidental remains.

In the paragraphs immediately following, Dr. Richardson repeats the arguments given in his former letter concerning the possibility of fusing coal, limestone, and other substances, without burning or calcining them. The inveterate disbelief of this gentleman, and his moderate share of chemical knowledge, prevent him from fairly appreciating the possibility of



such operations. As they are now, however, experimentally decided in the most ample and satisfactory manner to be perfectly possible, we do not find it necessary to dwell longer upon these remarks. To the same forgetfulness we commit the succeeding efforts of the doctor's wit, which are too sober for jocularity, and too flippant for argument. By the way, we can give the reader a clue to find out where these jokes lie: wherever he espies a quotation of Latin or Greek, there lurks a joke: 'Latet anguis in herba.' Soon after this we find him returned to his serious mood, considering the elevation of the strata from the bottom of the ocean. There need surely be no difficulty in allowing the possibility of supporting strata in this position, whatever other objections may be made, when we consider that before our own eyes islands have risen to the surface, forced up by the influence of internal fires. At this place Dr. Richardson again reverts to the parallelism of the strata to the horizon in the small district surrounding him, which he insists cannot have been elevated from so great a depth as is supposed in so horizontal a position. We have already delivered our opinion of this local fact, and we repeat that an equal expansive force being applied to every part of the strata examined by the doctor, they must necessarily have remained in their level or nearly so; and in a small spot like this under consideration, it cannot appear wonderful that such a thing should occasionally take place.

The next point of importance with which we meet is the assertion that basalt or whynnstone is arranged in more regular strata than any body whatever. At the enunciation of this opinion we paused with considerable surprise. Often as it has been our fate to wander among the wildest rocks, we do not remember, either in whynn or basalt, ever to have seen any vestige of such an arrangement. It is a circumstance, however, which we highly desire to be further minutely examined with the eye of philosophical perspicacity and candour. The extreme obviousness which the doctor attributes to this stratification considerably impairs our confidence in its existence. It is not probable that so very plain a thing should have to this time of day remained undecided. We cannot help supposing that some circumstance has deceived this gentleman, that he may have mistaken some other phenomena for those of stratified basalt. We believe it to have been nothing different from the effect of crystallization upon a large mass, by which it is divided in a regular manner, imitating the appearances of strata. This point is of very great importance, and the scientific world is peculiarly obliged to Dr. Richardson for drawing their attention towards it, and more especi-

ally for pointing out the precise spot where the reality of the fact may be finally ascertained. We hope the opportunity will not long escape our expert and sagacious mineralogists.

We have now arrived at the conclusion of this letter, the length of our observations upon which we have suited rather to the magnitude and importance of the subject than to the diminutive size of the production. In following the doctor through his course, we have been convinced that he has been frequently misled by false views of the subject, and occasionally by want of acquaintance with the sciences connected with mineralogy, and illustrative of its operations. Some parts of his arguments bear, however, strongly upon Dr. Hutton's assertions, and the adherents of the latter gentleman's theory are called upon to repeat or acknowledge the observations of Dr. Richardson. By thus extending our practical knowledge of mineralogical phenomena, they will, if they only avoid the false beacons of abortive wit and misplaced quotation, and if they seek only the support of sober and temperate discussion, tend to wipe off some of those aspersions by which their opponent has calumniated not their theory alone, but every effort of human genius which has departed from the just but naked and unseemly enunciation of facts.

After all the violence of opposition, and the occasional sarcasms, which Dr. Richardson has presented to Mr. Playfair, the reader will be surprised to hear that universal quietus proposed, which, in this island, has the happy power to unite friends by closer ties, and to soften the asperities of enemies. The bitterness of political hostility has vanished before its appearance, and it is acknowledged to be an universal panacea for civic dissensions and parish turmoils. In plain language, Dr. Richardson invites his opponent to a mineralogical dinner in the neighbourhood of the Giant's Causeway: so at least we understand one of the concluding paragraphs of the last letter. At this entertainment the doctor proposes not only to confute Mr. Playfair himself, but, that the bitterness of his affliction may not be without alloy, that some consolation may beam upon him in his distresses, all other theories are to be refuted at the same time. It must be truly instructive to the lovers of science, to see these two mighty philosophers on the scene of their amicable contention. A block of amorphous whynnstone for their table, should be surrounded by broken pillars of basalt for seats; for salt-sellers, might be used shells of a chosen size, from Portrush-stone. We fear these mineralogical commodities would ill supply the place of our old-fashioned viands, so we agree to the production of some of *these* antiquities. As for fuel, we think Mr. Playfair should be compelled to furnish the necessary quantity of central fire. If, in these favourable circumstances, they cannot settle the

points of disputation, and arrive at some compromise, we must at least conclude that the quarrels of philosophers are yet more hard to appease than the petty intrigues and parochial broils of aldermen and church-wardens, which have never been known to withstand such applications.

Although we have in most instances dissented from the truth of Dr. Richardson's arguments, and from the accuracy of his observations, we by no means wish to deny to that gentleman the praise which his ingenuity and his diligence have deserved. We cannot say that the humility of the doctor has unstrung our nerves, or spared one remark which we felt a disposition to make. Where we have argued against any observations made by Dr. Richardson himself, we are far from wishing to impeach his credibility, which we doubt not is unimpeachable. We have directed our scepticism only to the meaning attached by him to particular words. We now take our leave of the doctor, with our warmest wishes for the continuance and the success of his geological enquiries.

*Polite Literature.* Art. 1. 'Essay on the Rise and Progress of Rhyme. By Theophilus Swift, Esq. A Prize Essay.'—In this essay on the rise and progress of rhyme, to which was adjudged the gold prize-medal proposed by the Royal Irish Academy for the best essay on that subject, read Nov. 9th, 1801, Theophilus Swift, esq. the author, endeavours to prove that rhyme is coeval with language, and the universal voice of nations. Before we enter into the detail of his arguments, we must observe that there is an apparent inconsistency in his asserting that 'rhyme formed a very strong feature in the venerable face of the Hebrew poetry,' although he confesses he has but 'a slender knowledge of the sacred text;' and in his not allowing father Lafitau, in the learned father's *Mœurs des Sauvages*, tom. 2, to have any authority for saying, that the rhyme or 'teleutic music' does not enter into the rhythm of the Hurons and Troquois, because forsooth the learned father 'might have been mistaken through his want of a thorough and perfect knowledge of the language of these savages.' So Theophilus Swift, esq. is to argue a point successfully, in spite of an avowed ignorance of the leading and most material circumstance relating to that point; and father Lafitau is not, because Theophilus Swift, esq. supposes he might have been as ignorant as himself!

With regard to the poetry of the Hebrews, we almost agree with Vossius, in thinking that 'Hebræorum qualis fuerit poësis, adeo nobis ignotum, quàm quod ignotissimum; nam quæcunque de hac scripsere nonnulli, istiusmodi sunt, ut longè melius fuisset ea tacuisse.' Vossius de Viribus Cantûs et Rhythmî.

At least, we cannot without reproof suffer Theophilus Swift, esq. after his avowal of 'a slender knowledge of the sacred text,' to say, he is as fully persuaded that the rhyme had an existence in Hebrew poetry, as in the verses of Dryden.

If so, why does he not, to show his persuasion to be reasonable, produce one single proof to corroborate his unqualified assertion from some other authority besides that of Le Clerc, who, though a critic generally most judicious, was in this instance we think (and we are by no means unsupported in our opinion by the greatest Hebrew scholars) bigoted in favour of an hypothesis? For as to Garofalo and Fourmontius, the latter of whom Mr. Swift, when he wrote his essay, had never seen, and their learned associates whom he does not even name, we shall be contented with opposing to them Psalmanazar, Calmet, and the profound author of the *Brevis Confutatio*, so well qualified, if any one can be, from his inestimable Hebrew *Prælectiones*, to speak decisively upon such a subject.

We have the longer dwelt upon the Hebrew language, as it is the parent of all others; and if it can be shown, which we hope it has been, that it is at least as yet a matter of doubt, notwithstanding the boldness of our rhyming friend Theophilus, or, as he would more properly be called, Rhythophilus, from the balance of authorities on each side of the question, whether rhyme did or did not enter into the Hebrew poetry, it will be also a matter of doubt whether or not it was known to many other nations.

With regard to the Otaheitan poetry, we shall not presume to speak of that, nor of the Hindû, nor of the Chinese; except indeed that we shall say a few words concerning the first of these, by way of retorting the arguments of Mr. Swift, against father Lafitau, upon himself, and *his* authorities, who also might have been mistaken, from the want of a thorough and perfect knowledge of the tongues of the natives of the South Sea Islands, in their opinion that rhyme formed a part of savage poetry. How easy, for instance, supposing the savages to make use of a measure like the entire Trochaic (and we may as well suppose that, as any thing our author supposes, for we do not understand him to speak from *his own knowledge*), for an ear not accustomed to their pronunciation to mistake the middle, where in the Trochaic line we all know there is a sort of natural division, for the end of a verse; and because there were two words that sounded alike in or about the middle of two immediately succeeding or separated lines, to mistake these for the rhyme, or 'teleutic music!' There is no language in which there is not a variety of words that have a

similar termination; but it is essential to rhyme, that the similarity should be that of two corresponding words at the close of two different lines (except in the case of monkish rhyme, which Mr. Swift will hardly argue was of Hebrew or Otaheitan origin), either closely, or at a distance, tallying one to the other: and unless we correctly knew by what rules the dead Hebrews, or living savages, formed their verse, we cannot know the end from the middle of a line; and therefore cannot say that either of their languages admitted the rhyme, or 'teleu tic music.'

We shall not contest the matter with Mr. Swift, concerning the several dialects of the Phœnician, Syrian, Arabic, Persic, or Scythian poetry; but shall only observe, that unless he can prove these and numerous other nations, from Æthiopia to Peru, all of which he ostentatiously introduces into his superficial essay, not only now to use the rhyme, but also to have used it from the earliest ages, he proves nothing in favour of his argument 'that rhyme is cœval with language.'

We shall indeed cursorily notice what our author says of the poetry of Scythia, carried (according to his reason and analogy) by the Elamites into that country; for he draws a most extraordinary inference from a passage in one of Ovid's epistles, written during his banishment, that the Getæ made use of rhyme. Let our readers compare the passage and the inference:

'Ah! pudet—et Getico scripsi sermone libellum,  
 Strictaque sunt nostris barbara verba modis.  
 Et placui, (gratulare mihi) cœpique poetæ  
 Inter inhumanos nomen habere Getas.'

'The first line of this passage strongly implies that the poet had composed Latin verse with the Getic rhyme: and the second as strongly that he had also adapted the Getic words to the Roman quantities; this comment has never, I apprehend, before been offered.' Essay on Rhyme, page 41.

For the credit of commentators we hope it has not—the interpretation of the first line from Ovid we mean, for as to that of the second, it is the right one. But 'sermo,' O Theophilus! means 'language,' and not 'rhyme.'

It is an excellent method of imposing upon the pigmies of literature, to 'found an hypothesis upon nothing, and then to form a system upon that hypothesis.\*

---

\* We are indebted for this remark to an author as learned as he is fanciful, who signs himself Crinitus, and writes in the *Literary Journal*. We wish he would exert his strength against nobler game than that which he is now pursuing.



But to come to the Greek language. Mr. Swift supposes his quotation from the 24th idyll of Theocritus 'never to have been made for the purpose he makes it before.' This, as we have seen, is not the first instance of his pluming himself upon originality of observation. For what purpose? To prove that the Greeks admitted rhyme into their poetry? How does it do that? What 'teleutic music,' what similarity of sound between two words at the end of two different lines, is there in the following passage?

Ἑυδὲτ', ἴμα βρεφία, γλυκερον καὶ ἀγερσιμοὶ ὕπνου,  
Ἑυδὲτ' ἴμα ψυχὰ, δὴ ἀδελφεῶ, εὖστοι τεχνὰ,  
Ὀλβιοὶ εὐναζοισθε, καὶ ὀλβιοὶ αὖ ἱκοισθε.

But Mr. Theophilus Swift calls these, 'euphonic assonants.' Let them be so: they are not rhymes; nor more to his purpose than the following lines from Moschus would have been, had he recollected them; which also, by accident (nor, as Psalmanazar said, let rare accidents be taken for invariable nature) have a monkish rhyme in them; but which however, are not at all conducive to the support, on the contrary, from their very rarity, are subversive, of his general argument:

Ἄι αἶ, ται μαλακαὶ μὲν ἔπαν κατὰ κᾶπον ὀλῶνται,  
Ἡ τὰ χλωρὰ σελίνα, τὸ τ' εὐθαλὲς ἔλον ἀνήθον,  
Ἵστερον αὖ ζῶσιν, καὶ εἰς ἔτος ἄλλο φροντι·

The Latins, Mr. Swift concedes (kind concession!), did not rhyme their verse; indeed, notwithstanding his boasted instance from Theocritus, and his *la la* songs noticed by Lucian, he grants also that the Greeks, while they retained the purity of their language, did not, any more than the Latins, rhyme their verse, but on the contrary (Mr. Swift's very words) 'abstruded the rhyme from it by metre and quantity.' He here forgot that if rhyme was *natural*, as he says it is, to all languages, it would, in spite of this 'abstrusion,' have recurred to the Greek and Latin. 'Naturam expellat furcâ, tamen usque recurret.'

We shall conclude with one of our author's general inferences from his premises; the truth of which he conceives himself, by such arguments as we have detailed above, to have perfectly established: 'that each successive people, at their first migration from the parent stock, used the language in which they were capable to converse!' And what other language, good Mr. Swift, could they possibly have used, but that in which they were capable to converse?

As we always like to leave a writer in good humour with himself and his critics, we shall stop at this conclusion; which is so indisputably founded upon truth, that we shall not have the hardihood to contest the reasonableness of its author. At parting, however, we will ask him one simple question. Does it not, upon second thoughts, occur to his mind, that rhyme, as it so generally appeared in Europe after the irruption of the Northern nations, and not before it, *might in some slight degree have owed its introduction into politer countries to those Barbarians?*

Art. 2. 'Notices relative to some of the Native Tribes of North America. By John Dunne, Esq.'—The notices of Mr. Dunne, relative to some of the native tribes of North America, are extremely curious and entertaining. He is a strong advocate for the mild treatment and civilization of the conquered Indians by their colonial masters. He describes them as a people capable of every improvement; not as the philosophers, the Paus and the Raynals, who have only viewed them at a distance, and through the medium of imperfect reports, have described them, as an inferior race of men.

'If a well organized brain, a bosom stored with natural feelings and affections, if a body active and enduring, a passion for sports, a love for manly pleasures, if contempt of danger, the firm grasp of friendship, the fire of eloquence, the devotion to a country, if the combinations more or less varied of these active, heroic, and social virtues, are the characteristic of a man, I do from my soul believe the Indian testimony; *the man of the land is a man, a real man*, and not of that *inferior race of men*, conceived by the philosophers. Observe too at what time this estimate of Indian talent is made, while the Indian is yet in his infancy, and in the gristle; with a scanty agriculture, no pastoral riches, his resource the wilderness: less advanced in the paths of civilized life, than the half-lettered Greek tribes, when they first united under the banners of Agamemnon; those very tribes who a few centuries afterwards replaced the names of Achilles, Ulysses, and Nestor, with those of Epaminondas, Plato, and Homer. I have named Homer, but certainly without any profane allusion, the simple reductions here communicated are the first dawns of genius; such tales and fables as might have passed current at the Scæan gate, or beguiled the hours at the ships, or under the tents at the Scamander. Though the age of Homer would have disclaimed them, may they not resemble the amusements of the age of Homer's heroes, the precursors of Homer?'

Mr. Dunne then favours us with a translation into English of three Indian fables, which he heard himself from the mouths of the natives, and which certainly display more power of combination and arrangement than we believed these savages to possess. He favours us also with one Latin trans-

lation of an Indian fable, which was too indecent to be rendered into English. The Indians, we see by this story, are not destitute of an Apuleius, as unconfined in his fancies as the author of the Golden Ass.

This article is concluded by some strictures, which are modestly called imperfect, upon Indian language. Mr. Dunne seems to have had every opportunity that a scholar could wish for, to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the tongue, the manners, and the customs, of the several savage tribes he consorted with; and by the information he gives us, by his translations, and remarks upon the different dialects, he seems to have availed himself as he ought of those opportunities.

Art. 3. 'Some Considerations on the History of ancient amatory Writers, and the comparative Merits of the three great Roman elegiac Poets, Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius. By William Preston, Esq.'—After some considerations on the history of ancient amatory writers, in which the author, contrary, and we think with reason, to sir Wm. Jones's opinion, contends that erotic compositions are not the growth of rude manners and early ages of society, he enters upon his subject as follows:

'Ovid surpasses his rivals and cotemporaries, in fancy, gaiety, ingenuity, and wit; Tibullus in nature, pathos, real tenderness, sweetness, ease, and unaffected simplicity; Propertius excels in sublimity, loftiness of manner, dignity and refinement of sentiment, purity of passion, and learning, in which last respect he sometimes however runs riot, and may justly incur the censure of pedantry.'

Mr. Preston then enters into their respective characters, as amatory writers, more in detail. Mr. Preston is a poet himself; as his translation of Apollonius Rhodius, and of some passages from the authors he compares in this essay, very creditably witness. The following remark is to us original and just. 'As I cannot but think there is much similarity of genius, so there seems to be a similarity of fortunes, between Propertius and Petrarch. Propertius and Petrarch each seem to have felt more pain than pleasure from his passion.' This remark is strongly confirmed in the following passage, which, to the reader well acquainted with the poetry of Propertius and of Petrarch, will carry conviction with it.

'As Petrarch strongly resembled Propertius, in his feeling all the importance and elevation of the character of a lover and a poet: so, these authors rejoice alike, in a sort of mysticism, compounded of the inspirations and enthusiasm of love and poetry. They exult in their sufferings, they make a merit of their voluntary self-abandonment, of their sacrifices of peace and comfort. They pride themselves, in the being as much distinguished by their sorrows as their genius. It is a favourite topic with them, to repre-

sent how much the character of a lover, and a sincere and ardent passion, tend to sublime the thoughts above selfish and sordid cares; how the devoted attachment to a virtuous and high-minded woman contributes to purify the heart, and affections; to ennoble the wishes; to reclaim the warm and unrestrained feelings of youth, even through their own ardour, from low and sensual libertinism, from frivolous amusements, and the pursuit of base and unworthy objects. Propertius is the only poet of antiquity, who seems to view love in this advantageous light, and to speak of the fair sex, with something like rapturous deference, and true refinement. Such language and sentiments seemed to grow out of the manners of chivalry; and, in fact, Propertius deserves to be studied as an extraordinary phenomenon, who shews, in a period when they were generally unknown, the sentimental dignity, or rises to the spiritual devotion, which finds, in the love for one, an antidote against the allurements of the rest of the sex; a preservative of general morality, an incentive to new exertions of genius, and industry, and new motives for valuing reputation and fame, not for the sake of self alone, but, in the hope of becoming more worthy of the beloved object. All this was well understood in the times of Petrarch, but was little known at the court of Augustus.

Mr. Preston justifies his observations by numerous parallel passages from both authors. The essay concludes with a translation by sir William Jones, of one of the many Asiatic poems upon the loves of Mejunum and Leila, the Romeo and Juliet of the East. In this translation will be seen a wonderful similarity of sentiment, with that which pervades the love verses of Petrarch and of Propertius; namely, a kind of ardent amorous devotion, an uncommon tenderness and refinement, flowing from the utmost enthusiasm of pure attachment.

Mr. Preston, with much modesty, like his countryman Mr. Dunne, expresses his fear that his remarks upon this subject are very imperfect, and contain no novelty. On the contrary, we think that both he and Mr. Dunne have conveyed very agreeable matter to their readers in a very agreeable manner; that they have felt their depth, and not ventured beyond it; while Theophilus Swift, esq. by aiming at too much, has accomplished too little for the praise of any article except that of his own academy.

*Antiquities.*—Art. 1. ‘An Inscription on an antient sepulchral Stone, or Monument, in the Church-yard of Kilcummin, with some Remarks on the same. By the Rev. James Little.’—If the Academy have no better papers to produce upon *antiquities*, they might as well leave the subject entirely alone. How ‘*the progress of the arts*,’ in the sister kingdom, ‘*in the middle ages*,’ can be evinced by so rude and unintelligible an inscription, it is impossible to see.

The stone appears formed into four compartments, by the figure of a cross; in each of which several characters are inscribed. Mr. Little's ingenious '*conjecture* about the meaning of it' is as follows:

'I suppose then that the characters are to be read, not regularly in each of the four compartments, in the stone separately, nor yet in lines across the adjoining compartments laterally, but by alternate couplets of lines on each side, in the following order, viz.

ORT

*a p**m a I**a n**n +**m*

I C §

C T

'And I understand them to denote as follows:

'Obiit R T (Ricardus vel Rodericus, &c. Toole vel Teigue, &c.)

'Allæ (i. e. Killallæ) Princeps. Maii 1mo.

'ANNO + (Crucis) Millesimo 1mo centesimo § (i. e. secundo vel quinto).

'The letters *a p*, which are here supposed to mean Allæ princeps, should perhaps be rendered Allæ præcentor or prebendarius, and may have belonged to the saint, who might have been the præcentor, or a prebendary of the chapter of the see of Killallæ, and the initials of his real name been R. T; and he might have afterward received the name of Commyn from the church of Killcummin, in which he officiated: and then the inscription may run (in English) thus—

"Died R. T. (suppose Ricard or Roderic Toole or Teigue, &c.) prince (or precentor) of Killalla, on May the 1st, in the year of the Cross, 1102."

'The letters C. T. I suppose to be the initials of the name of the son or successor of R T. who erected the monument to the memory of the latter. These four only are capital letters.

'There is a piece broken from the lower part of the stone; but is evident there were never any characters inscribed on it.

'Now whatever doubt may be entertained as to the meaning of the rest of the inscription, I think there can be none as to the date, except in the last figure or mark §, which I take to be the Arabic numeral character or figure 2, or perhaps 5: and I am induced to think so, for these reasons.'

The introduction of the Arabic numeral 2 or 5 into so early an inscription, is entirely new. The instance which Mr. Little quotes from Dr. Wallis has long been universally acknowledged as erroneous. The vulgar figures which we now use were not generally received, even in this country, before the fifteenth century; and though occasional instances may be discovered two centuries earlier, their existence in the Norman period may be fairly questioned. Carrying the antiquity of the stone still higher, by supposing the 2 a Greek numeral, is ridiculous.



ART. VII.—*Harvest Home: Consisting of Supplementary Gleanings, Original Dramas and Poems, Contributions of Literary Friends, and Select Republications; including Sympathy, a Poem, revised, corrected, and enlarged, from the eighth Edition. By Mr. Pratt. 3 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. Phillips. 1805.*

HEARTILY do we congratulate our readers upon the ominous title of Mr. Pratt's present publication. Has he then really dragged his last heavy load of nonsense home? We join in the 'holla' of his fellow-labourers with the most tumultuous joy. Long has every acre of the field in which he gleaned been barren. Let it now lie fallow. To drop Mr. Pratt's metaphor, we shall endeavour in plain English to prove, out of his own mouth, that there never was an author, who with so many opportunities of conveying amusement to his readers, conveyed so little; whose remarks upon places and persons were so void of interest and originality; who upon the whole was such a perfect book-maker, even in this book-making generation.

In his first volumes of 'Gleanings,' in the very first pages of them, our author displayed the natural bent and temper of his mind. Mr. Pratt is a sentimentalist, and has written a poem upon humanity; another upon sympathy! Gentle moralist! In a word, he is one of those 'many men, many women, and many children', whose heads have been perverted, like M. Karamsin's, whom we had occasion to notice in our last number, by the two arch-priests of sensibility, Rousseau and Sterne. We shall take this as the leading clue to his character; and trace him through the labyrinth of these ponderous tomes, as the minotaur of old was traced, by his 'mugitus.'

The prolix title-page sufficiently analyzes, and indeed supersedes, the contents of this production. It opens with a dedication to the prince of Wales, as the patron of *polite literature*. If so, what possible claim can Mr. Pratt have to the notice of his royal highness? We must present our readers with an extract from this phoenix of a dedication:

'At a moment like the present, it would be unpardonable, in a votary of literature and lover of mankind, not to embrace the earliest opportunity to join my sincere homage, however feeble, to that of an enlightened empire, on your royal highness's encouragement to the cause of literature, by unrolling, transcribing, and deciphering, the almost perished MSS. of Herculaneum and Pompeii. This, sir, almost without a figure, is helping the phoenix of wisdom to rise resplendent from her ashes.' P. iv.

The dedication is followed by a preface, professing to be

explanatory of the title of 'Harvest Home;' but unless, as we hope, and by that hope are perhaps too fondly tempted to believe, it is really *ominous*, it is, like numerous other parts of the book, utterly devoid of meaning. The preface is succeeded by an introduction, in which that well-known sentiment 'that there are few things purely evil, of which we can say without some emotion of uneasiness, *This is the last*' is applied to Mr. Pratt's Harvest Home, and intended to obviate our interpretation of the title. But we are sorry to be obliged by our office as inspectors of the literary department, to consider Mr. Pratt's writings, in point of style, as 'purely evil;' and therefore, so far from saying with any emotion of uneasiness 'This is the last,' to use a homely phrase, we should really look upon this author's departure from the world of literature as a good riddance of bad rubbish; we should, in short, prefer his room to his company, and like Phaon, not even utter, '*Lesbi puella, vale!*'

Ample contents then shew us our bill of fare, with, as Mr. Pratt himself prettily observes, the 'sauce and garnish.' These, we suppose, are the *valuable* communications of Mr. Morfitt on the subject of Birmingham, extracted probably from the Guide to that place, as the information respecting Southampton is, with an avowal impudent enough, from sir Harry Englefield's account, and that of several other tourists.—More of Mr. Morfitt anon.

The supplementary gleanings (like the supplementary militia, the dregs of the county) then begin in Hampshire. They are addressed, as heretofore, to the baron de B.... Why not as well to prince Prettyman, or the marquis of Caraba, or Puss in boots? We shall cursorily pass over the 'Hampshire station,' as Mr. Pratt absurdly enough entitles it, and reserve ourselves for the second appearance of Mr. Morfitt at Birmingham; when we shall with pleasure exclaim '*Ecce iterum Crispinus.*'

We are first kindly told the boundaries of Hampshire. Our ancestors surely must have been very inattentive to the limits of the counties of their native land, to make this information necessary at the present day. But the age we live in, with regard to the state of its literature, may be aptly termed the era of republication. As Guthrie therefore is grown obsolete, Mr. Pratt obligingly revives his matter, in a more modern and fashionable manner. Such must have been the motive of Mr. James Petit Andrews in editing his History of England; for this reason, in his deep researches into the treasures of the British Museum, he has laboured to inform us that such a king as Henry the Fifth once reigned, which indeed one Hume had pleasantly enough already told us, and what were the games chiefly

played by the people of England in his reign ; such also must have been the laudable inducement of Mr. Walter Scott to go into the Advocates' library at Edinburgh, and copy old records of Border quarrels and alliances. What other motive but this of adorning these well-known facts, or facts little worthy to be known, with the graces of their style, could have brought these authors before the public (we allude not to Mr. Scott's poetical performances), we are at a loss to imagine.

But to return to Mr. Pratt. At Southampton he busies himself in transcribing bad epitaphs in the church-yard ; and also favours us with some historical facts relating to that place. But we do not lose the moralist in the historian. Ecce hominem !

*' Southampton, November 3, 1799.*

' The whole of the past month has been interrupted by showers—the sun has been able to appear only by a casual glimpse ; but his visits, though short, were welcome : perhaps not the less so for having been so sparing of his rays. Alas ! such is too often our estimate and measurement of every good.

' Of those returns, however, of his transitory splendour, I have availed myself, after long wooing the goddesses of the sea and of the air. Poetical fable would have been very incomplete had those life-sustaining and health-renewing powers been excluded from the mythology.

' Yet, O how delicious are the sun-beams thus rescued, as it were, from the storm ! Like happiness and health, after grief and sickness, they are but the more exquisitely relished. With what rapidity are those effulgent moments darted through every obstruction ! The enlightened clouds themselves seem to be relieved, and to smile : the countenance of earth and heaven brighten up ; and a single hour of returning sunshine, like that of joy from some heart-felt occurrence, makes us forget that we had ever been enveloped in sorrow or in gloom. I have experienced, my friend, the force of both these transitions. The most sudden alternations have happened in the elements of nature and of life ; and I shall now proceed to describe some of their consequent influences on the short but interesting excursions, which the uncertain state of the weather permitted me to seize. By catching the Sol of the minute I sallied forth, and was abundantly gratified. Perseverance has sometimes been known to meet its reward from the most capricious of the goddesses above and below, even Fortune herself.

' On one of the most resplendent days that have ever been presented by Nature to her admirers, or by Autumn to her enthusiasts, your correspondent, who you are not now to be told is one of their warmest, truest votaries, made a pause at the neat, airy, genteel, well-bred, little town of Wickam. Nature, indeed, exhausted with weeping, appeared disposed to atone for the past, and to restore her drooping powers. Her most radiant orb shone, as if to dry up her tears, which, with more than the passion of Niobe,

had fallen upon, and almost deluged, the earth. It was on this fair morn, that the gleaner went forth with some friends, as if to do homage in the temple of the sun, whose gorgeous palace opened his glories at a thousand portals; each beaming with the light, the majesty, and the benevolence of heaven. p. 46.

From this one passage we think our readers may very fairly measure the height, and the depth, and the breadth of Mr. Pratt's wisdom.

At Winchester Mr. Pratt copies the monumental inscription in honour of Dr. Warton, and obliges us with Mr. Richard Mant's verses to the memory of the worthy head master of Winchester school. Of these verses we shall only say, that their pervading dullness is a little relieved by the pertness of the following note upon Milton's ignorance:

'Mr. Mant says, I have taken the liberty of adopting this pronunciation, notwithstanding Milton's authority to the contrary. The word as it frequently occurs in the Squieres Tale, is necessarily and uniformly *Cambuscân*: *e. g.*

'This noble king, this Tartre *Cambuscan*.  
(C. T. 10343.) Milton was, in all probability, not aware of the title of Khan of Tartary.' p. 64.

Poor Milton!

We would willingly copy a passage (page 80) concerning a dairy. It begins thus: 'But what shall we say of the *dairy*?' Pathetic apostrophe! What indeed? But our limits forbid us to riot in such absurdities.

At Rumsey we have more epitaphs. Mr. Pratt is absolutely a walking church-yard. Little Daniel was nothing to him. We must only refer our readers to page 96, where they will find 'skeletons of landscapes,' nearly as ridiculous as some other 'skeletons,' published not a hundred miles from London.

Before we enter into the New Forest, we are presented with a tributary sketch of the author of 'Forest Scenery;' where 'the gleaner' (for as Mr. Pratt has chosen that appellation, let him by all means enjoy it) congratulates himself upon having agreed with Mr. Gilpin in admiring the same places, objects, &c. We cannot *congratulate* Mr. Gilpin upon this similarity of taste.

Page 141 will delight the lovers of dialogue with some select specimens of rural simplicity. 'Simplicity' is another of Mr. Pratt's favourite qualities. But it is not

'Illa priorum  
Simplicitas:'

it is the modern mawkish simplicity of ballad-mongers, and sentimental novelists. It is, in short, such a simplicity as that

which is described in some very simple silly stanzas (pages 239 and 240) of the first volume of 'Harvest Home.' From page 157 to page 169, we are pestered with more epitaphs, distinguishable for nothing but the remarkable injudiciousness of their selector, who must have taken pains to find out the very worst in every church-yard he so idly traversed; we should rather say the most moderate, for excessive badness in composition, as Mr. Pratt often shows, is entertaining. But at page 201 there is a burst of eloquence which we cannot resist the temptation of transcribing:

'O wonderful, interesting, transcendent MAN, what an object art thou in every part of the inhabited earth! Gardens, groves, forests, the rill, the brook, the river, the mighty deep—the cot, the mansion, the magnificent palace—what are each, or all of these, without thy animating presence? At once majestic and endearing Being! how often, after I have surveyed with wonder and admiration the fairest, noblest, and the best of these, have I looked around for the only object wanting to complete the scene! how often have I strained the eye, and wearied the foot to find important man! Yes, thou "paragon of nature," I have drooped and languished amidst the choicest of thy vernal, summer, and autumnal charms, dear as they are to me, when deprived of thy more precious society. Sweet is solitude, sweet the alternations of season, of sun and of shade; but truly can I exclaim, in words which the poet has given to the first lover, the first friend, and the first companion, "Nothing without thee, O fellow-man! can long be sweet."

We have said that Mr. Pratt had many opportunities of conveying amusement to his readers. Certainly, tramping as he has been for years over England, or, if at home, sitting in his easy chair, and writing tours, assisted at least by the information of mail-coach guards, and gentlemen riders, we may with truth say he might have been able to compile one entertaining pocket companion to the Isle of Wight, &c. &c.—but nature forbade—and he has put together six or seven heavy volumes of Reflections, Epitaphs, Poems, Landscape Skeletons, and valuable communications from Mr. Morfitt, and entitled the farrago 'Gleanings' and 'Harvest Home.'

Ecce iterum Crispinus. This gentleman naturally introduces us to 'the Warwickshire station,' and particularly to Birmingham; where we may observe *en passant* that the Gleaner was attracted by the title of a pamphlet in a shop-window, bearing the name of Job Nott, Button-maker, for its author. We will venture, for once, to agree with the Gleaner, in his favourable opinion of this little work. It is a truly loyal and sensible pamphlet, and in point of style, plain and intelligible (we mean no allusion) to the *meanest* capacities; in



a word, it is an excellent imitation, in manner, of the Draper's Letters.

Mr. Morfitt's first 'valuable communication' concerning Birmingham, is, that it is famous for good ale. He concludes his first letter with the following sentence: 'I write in great haste—the bawling Welshman proclaims it to be past the noon of night. Health and happiness attend you! "from night till morn, from morn till dewy eve!"' But we must do Mr. Morfitt the justice to observe, that however irrelevant, unconnected, and desultory his *remarks* upon the trade and manufactures of Birmingham may be, his account of the workshops and warehouses, poor-houses and charitable institutions in that place, is by far the most interesting part of 'Harvest Home.' Where Mr. Morfitt has only to count ten, he counts them right. We cannot say so much for the 'Gleaner.' In his mutilated detail of the hospitals in London, foisted into 'the Warwickshire station' to swell his book, the half-justice which his insipid style has done to the benevolence of our country in mentioning some of its noble instances, but ill compensates for the injustice he has done it, in omitting many others. Upon the whole, however, until we come to the concluding nonsense about master Betty, we must allow the 'Warwickshire station' (Mr. Pratt will observe how studiously we compliment him in the quotation of his capricious titles) to contain an useful though dull republication of former accounts of Birmingham. We say 'useful,' because we think the knowledge of the state of our trade and manufactures cannot be too widely spread.

This volume closes with a long extract from the *seventh edition* (*proh tempora!*) of Mr. Pratt's *own* poem of 'Humanity.' Like Longinus, Mr. Pratt 'is himself the great sublime he draws.' Mr. Pratt introduces the extract with an observation. 'On this peculiar occasion (Dr. Valpy's Sermon upon the 'Humane Society') I feel confident I shall stand acquitted by all generous readers, and all candid critics, for indulging in quoting a passage from myself, as well to illustrate the heartfelt subject, as to shew the deep sense I entertained of *its* merits, on the first publication of the *poem* from which the quotation is made, and preserved in every successive edition.' Such is the introduction of '*myself*,' 'to all generous readers and candid critics.' Alas! that *we* should lack so much of Mr. Pratt's 'sweet sensibility,' or 'pretty simplicity,' or by whatever name he pleases to call his 'emotions,' as, in his opinion, neither to desire nor deserve the soothing title of 'generous readers,' or 'candid critics.' We should consider such generosity and such candour as a violation of our duty; as a foolish clemency which would encourage repeated trans-

gression. We will never lend a hand to protect or to praise the weeds of our present wilderness of literature; but, with a ferocity, as Mr. Pratt would say, truly malignant, with a regard to justice as we ourselves profess, obviously necessary in the declining state of our taste, cut up such authors as himself by the root, and burn their sapless branches, and dry withered leaves, in the relentless fire of criticism.

It would be unpardonable in us not to mention, before we dismiss this volume, that we learn from Mr. Morfitt's valuable communications concerning Birmingham, that in the visit 'the hero of the Nile' paid to that place, he inspected the hand-whip manufactory!

The second volume of *Harvest Home* consists of three plays. The first Mr. Pratt calls a continental drama. It is intended as a satire upon the liberty and equality of republican France, and, as such, is not an unsuccessful performance. But it has neither liveliness of dialogue to boast of, nor discrimination of character. The title is 'Hail fellow! well met!' and the joke of it is explained in this distich:

'The maid is the mistress, the master's the man,  
For *higgledy-piggledy* now is the plan.'

This, as our readers will perceive, is low enough for the subject.

Mr. Pratt has adopted the custom of the German dramatic authors, in giving minute directions to the actors, what they are to do between every speech. Take an instance, page 32: 'Sir John affects laughter—Statuquo enjoys *one* of equal length and energy,' &c. &c. The enormous length of this play would render it as unfit for the stage, as it does render it tedious in perusal, although it might be shortened without losing any of the symmetry of its parts, or one act put before the other without spoiling its arrangement. It concludes with 'God save the King.'

'Love's Trials, or, The Triumph of Constancy,' a comic opera, in some introductory remarks on its dresses and ceremonies, is said to be founded on Prior's 'excellent modernization and enlargement of the beautiful ancient ballad of the Nut-brown Maid,' supposed to be written nearly three hundred years ago. This is so much in the style of one of the bills of the performances at the Royal Circus, and the opera itself is so much upon a par with 'Louisa of Lombardy,' and 'Abellino, or the Bravo's Bride,' that we cannot help recommending the author to devote his dramatic talents to the summer theatres (we would not as yet have him attempt the Haymarket), and in time we have no doubt, he may rival, if not excel, the wonder-

working Mr. Cross, or the ingenious Mr. Astley junior himself; and we may see future 'Jack the Giant Killers,' written and produced under the sole direction of Mr. Pratt, the Gleaner, even at the Royalty Theatre in Goodman's Fields. Let not Mr. Pratt be offended at the prophecy; he has himself quoted the observation that "ridicule is the most powerful sting that folly can experience; its wounds are deeper than those of direct reproach, and they have the additional and peculiar quality of being incurable."

In p. 248, we have a song *altered* from Prior—yet Prior wrote tolerable songs too, considering the age in which he lived. Fortunate is it for Mr. Pratt, that he was born in these days of genuine poetry; that he feels himself authorized to alter Prior, parody ancient ballads, page 264, compile songs from the earl of Surrey's sonnets, and enjoin them 'to be set with *solemn simplicity*,' page 304; that he can quote from his own 'Landscape in Verse,' page 335; write about 'fe, fa, fum,' page 338; and again, page 351, direct the composer for his opera to 'set a dialogue with *fervour and simplicity*.' Mr. Pratt, we see throughout, is 'simplex dun-taxat.'

The comic drama of 'Fire and Frost,' which concludes the second volume of 'Harvest Home,' is thus introduced to its readers. 'This drama is written partly on the model of the laugh-and-be-merry, hurry-scurry, slap-dash, and it might properly enough be added, helter-skelter, harum-scarum, kind of farce-and-pantomime comedy, which has of late been so much the rage (perhaps raving would be a more appropriate word) and partly in the style of the Old School of the English Theatre.' The beginning of this sentence put us in mind of prince Henry's speech to Francis the Drawer, about that 'old, puke-stocking, agate-ring, baldpate,' &c. &c. and we were ready to cry out with Francis—'O Lord, Sir, what do you mean?' Has Mr. Pratt then forgotten the advice of Horace, or did he never hear it? his attempt to unite the old and new comedy is completely 'to join a horse's neck to a human head.' It is to 'send unequal forms and minds, with a cruel jest, under a yoke of brass,' as Watson translates the passage. But, in truth, there is no danger that this oil-and-vinegar mixture should violate any of the rules of good taste in Mr. Pratt's comic drama of 'Fire and Frost;' for there is not a spice of the legitimate humour of the 'Old' comedy, nor a spangle of the false wit of the 'New' in its composition: Cadwallader is awkwardly imitated in one of the characters; and Tag in another; though this play, like the two former pieces, has a preface, and in that preface, not only disclaims plagiarism, but, by way of proof 'that two

great authors may hit upon the same thought,' declares that the coincidence of name and character, with the truncheon of the author's unsuccessful drama in the truncheon of Mr. Hurlstone's successful afterpiece, was an incidental coincidence! that he has not borrowed the last scene of 'Fire and Frost' from the ending of Paul and Virginia, and that Dr. Warton has observed (great authority this it must be allowed) that 'the allegation of resemblances between authors is indisputably true; but the charge of plagiarism, which is raised upon it, is not to be allowed with equal readiness.' We have only to remark, that this anxiety to anticipate a charge of plagiarism, is in our minds a strong conviction of a consciousness in the anxious person of his having 'stolen something, though perhaps not the very thing in point. Mr. Pratt endeavours to corroborate his own and Dr. Warton's opinion upon this subject, with some passages from different authors, which *might* be thought plagiarisms: one from the other, but which he thinks are not; we think they are. Let our readers decide between Mr. Pratt and us.

'Like roses, that in deserts bloom and die.'

Pope's Rape of the Lock.

'Full many a flow'r is born to blush unseen,

And waste its sweetness on the desert air.' Gray's Elegy.

'Dear, though disloyal, thou art still to me.'

Hannay's Poems.

Such a line as the above certainly may be an original one, for it expresses a very natural thought; but if copied from any thing, it is most probably copied from that line of Ovid:

'Perfida, sed quamvis perfida, cara tamen.'

As to Shenstone's ballad of Jemmy Dawson, no one could suppose any thing more than a coincidence, if it is even a coincidence, between the above line, and the stanza quoted from that delightful ballad.

'When sorrows come, they come not single spies,  
But in battalions.'

Shakespear's Hamlet.

'Woes cluster; rare are solitary woes;

They love a train, they tread each other's heels.'

Young's Night Thoughts.

As to Fitzgeffry's Life of Drake, Gray may not have seen it certainly, but Gray was an universal reader, and striking is the resemblance between the two following passages:

'— O therefore doe we plaine,

And therefore weep, because we weep in vaine!'

'I fruitless mourn to him that cannot hear,

And weep the more, because I weep in vain.'

Gray.

Gray, we will venture to affirm, was the greatest of all plagiarists. He had few thoughts of his own; but he seldom left any borrowed thought unadorned with the graces of his language. Mr. Wakefield, injudiciously as a wellwisher to the fame of Gray, but admirably as an honest commentator, has shown the public (all classical readers must have been ever aware of Gray's plagiarisms) from what copious stores our English bee pilfered his honey.

With regard to Markham's *Devorax*, Waller was the author of that beautiful stanza, which Mr. Pratt and his friends quote as from a modern song, in page 387 of the second volume of *Harvest Home*; and it is evident from the two passages, that Waller and Markham entered not into one another's heads.

'That engine of defence (the sword)  
With thee was but a needless instrument;  
Nature had given thee darts could better kill.'

Markham's *Devorax*.

'Attiring thee with so much art,  
Is but a barbarous skill;

'Tis like the pois'ning of a dart,  
Too apt before to kill.'

Modern Song. (vice Waller.)

Who but Mr. Pratt and his friends could suppose that these two passages would be taken for parallel ones, and then argue against their own chimæra? But our readers, like ourselves, must begin to be heartily tired of Mr. Pratt, and 'the valuable communications' of his literary coadjutors.

Yet, alas! there is another volume, and *that* of poetry, remaining for our consideration. The labours of Hercules were nothing to ours in reviewing Mr. Pratt, whether we compare his head and those of his friends' to the heads of the hydra, or the three volumes of *Harvest Home*, to the Augean stable, which we shall never clear of its *encumbrances*, unless we proceed in a more summary manner. Consign we therefore all the contributions to oblivion; omit we the offerings of the poet-laureat, and of the poet-laureat's daughter! banish Dr. Mavor, the British tourist! banish Charles James, esq! banish the Rev. Dr. \*\*\*; banish John Taylor, esq.; banish R. C. Dallas, esq; banish the Sybill; banish Dr. Woolcot to the isle of Capræe; banish Mr. Hutton, banish the 'Invisible Girl;' banish the lady and Dr. Busby; banish Mr. Meyler, and other friends; banish the Rev. Philip Parsons; banish John Buller, junior, and the clerk in Messrs. Boulton and Co's. counting-house; banish all but J. Morfitt, sweet J. Morfitt, ale-bibbing J. Morfitt, banish not him his gleaner's company; banish J. Morfitt with his bad *Alcaic* ode; and banish all the world: we do, we will.



And now let us 'sympathize' solely with the Gleaner. The current of our feelings, being undivided, will flow more strongly, in unison with his own. But it is to the poem 'Sympathy' alone, even of *his* superior productions, that we shall direct our regard. As to the stuff he calls 'the Physician,' and all his minor effusions, away with them, 'emendaturis ignibus.' It is to 'Sympathy,' we say, this select republication, 'Sympathy,' revised, corrected, and enlarged, that we devote our whole attention. And yet, although it will be contrary to our promise, we cannot help taking a last lingering look at our dear friend, J. Morfitt—one look, according to Caractacus, and then, "farewell for ever!"—More last words of J. Morfitt. Written on the last leaf of the corrected copy of Sympathy.

'Macte virtute esto, Patrone Pauperum elegantissime, miseriarum inurbanarum Pictor urbanissime, in quo reviviscit Goldsmithius. Pulchrè, φίλε θύμω, cogitas, et cogitata pulcherrimè loqueris. Nempe diceret Quintilianus, quod in hoc tuo Poemate optima verba rebus optimis cohærent. Non verbum amplius addam.

Vive, vale!

J. M.

Birmingham.'

*Elegant and intelligible* is thy Latin, courtly thy adulation, J. Morfitt, though thy residence is Birmingham.

Many other tributary addresses to the author of Sympathy, are prefixed to that poem. But as Dr. Solomon and Dr. Brodum in their advertisements remark, 'a numerous list of testimonies in our favour, would be tedious.' Let one suffice. So let J. Morfitt be to Mr. Pratt, what Alexander Murker long has been to the proprietor of Leake's patent pills, the sole and sufficient evidence of his deserts. And sweet must it be to Mr. Pratt, 'laudari à laudato viro.'

But we return to Sympathy. In this poem, Mr. Pratt, we think, appears in his best light; in his most natural character; not as a poet, though there are some pleasing passages that certainly display some power in the management of numbers; but as a man of feeling; for although we think his heart overflows rather too frequently for public exhibition, though, in general, his tendernesses are such as had better be confined to the select circle of his male and female intimates, yet we are ready and willing to allow him the full praise of having touched, at times, the genuine chord, that (in his own language) vibrates to the heart. We shall extract a passage from the first book of Sympathy, and not diminish our approbation in this instance by adhering to the rules of rigid criticism. Where the whole has pleased us, we will not too minutely examine the particular sources from which that pleasure flows.

‘ In life’s fair morn, I knew an aged seer,  
Who sad and lonely pass’d his joyless year ;  
Betray’d, heart-broken, from the world he ran,  
And shunn’d, oh dire extreme ! the face of man ;  
Humbly he rear’d his hut within the wood,  
Hermit his vest, a hermit’s was his food :  
Nich’d in some corner of the gelid cave,  
Where chilling drops the rugged rockstone lave,  
Hour after hour, the melancholy sage,  
Drop after drop to reckon, would engage  
The ling’ring day, and, trickling as they fell,  
A tear went with them to the narrow well.  
Then thus he moraliz’d as slow it pass’d :  
“ This brings me nearer Lucia than the last ;  
And this, now streaming from the eye,” said he,  
“ Oh, my lov’d child ! will bring me nearer thee.”

‘ When first he roam’d, his dog, with anxious care,  
His wand’rings watch’d, as emulous to share ;  
In vain the faithful brute was bid to go,  
In vain the sorrower sought a lonely woe.  
The hermit paus’d, th’attendant dog was near,  
Slept at his feet, and caught the falling tear :  
Up rose the hermit, up the dog would rise,  
And every way to win a master tries.  
“ Then be it so. Come, faithful fool,” he said ;  
One pat encourag’d, and they sought the shade ;  
An unfrequented thicket soon they found,  
And both repos’d upon the leafy ground ;  
Mellifluous murmurings told the fountains nigh,  
Fountains which well a pilgrim’s drink supply.  
And thence by many a labyrinth it led  
Where ev’ry tree bestow’d an ev’ning bed.  
Skill’d in the chace, the faithful creature brought  
Whate’er in morn or moon-light course he caught ;  
But the sage lent his sympathy to all,  
Nor saw unwept his dumb associates fall :  
He was, in sooth, the gentlest of his kind,  
And, though a hermit, had a social mind.  
“ And why,” said he, “ must man subsist by prey ?  
Why stop yon melting music on the spray ?  
Why, when assail’d by hounds and hunter’s cry,  
Must half the harmless race in terrors die ?  
Why must we work of innocence the woe ?  
Still shall this bosom throb, these eyes o’erflow.”  
Thus liv’d the master good, the servant true,  
Till to its God the master’s spirit flew.  
Beside a fount which daily water gave,  
Stooping to drink, the hermit found a grave ;  
All in the running stream his garments spread,  
And dark damp verdure ill conceal’d his head ;

The faithful servant from that fatal day  
 Watch'd the lov'd corpse, and hourly pin'd away ;  
 His head upon his master's cheek was found,  
 While the obstructed waters mourn'd around.'

Vol. III. p. 517.

We are not of opinion that the most devoted admirer of Mr. Pratt, his very 'fautor inepte,' could have done him more ample justice than we have, in the selection of the above story; founded, as to the dog, Mr. Pratt tells us in the notes, upon Montaigne's account of *king Lysimachus's dog Hyrcan*! But as Mr. Pratt has dedicated his book to the prince of Wales, we wonder, in his relation of the lives of miraculous dogs, he forgot that famous dog, of whom the epigram says, that he boasted to his companion:

'I am the prince of Wales's dog at Kew, sir!'

and then questioned him:

'And pray whose dog are you, sir?'

Mr. Pratt will surely not object to the childishness of this epigram, after what he has written concerning the dog 'Bouncer,' in the first volume of *Harvest Home*, p. 211.

Our limits will not allow us to quote another passage from 'Sympathy': but in the second book we will refer our readers to page 538, to the story of '*the beauteous maniac*;' which upon the whole is a well-told tale, though the subject has been a very hackneyed one since the days of Sterne's Maria. But as we are now about to bid, perhaps, an eternal adieu to Mr. Pratt, we must give him and his coadjutors a few serious words of advice at parting. 'Vanity' has been the fatal delusion that has exposed them to the censure of every person of sense, by inducing them to print their own condemnation, in conceited prose, and very moderate poetry. But, alas! in the present day the falsehood of that maxim of Horace has been completely proved. Who will now believe that

'mediocribus esse poetis

Non dī, non homines, non concessere columnæ,'

when 'Sympathy' has gone through eight editions? We cannot indeed blame the authors so much as the readers of the trash that daily issues from the press. 'Novelty' is the charm; but in our judgment a good old thing is infinitely preferable to a bad new one. But though the Augustan age of English literature be irrevocably gone, yet the Spectators, the Tatlers, and the Guardians, introduced as they are anew, with the exclusion of their temporary matter, to the notice of the rising generation, will, we hope, still have some effect in giving our

children a distaste for the execrable style of our modern compositions. As for our grown ladies and gentlemen who have been in the habit of reading and admiring Mr. Pratt and his fellows, *their* relish for the real beauty of the English language must have been long corrupt, they are past the hope of curing; let them continue from choice greedily to devour the raw morsels of literature which we are in duty bound to swallow, and we doubt not, in spite of *our* opposition, however rotten may be the heads of corn of which they compose their sheaves, other Pratts, other Della Cruscas, and other Karamsins, will have reason to rejoice, each in the undeserved produce of his *harvest-home*.

## MONTHLY CATALOGUE.

### RELIGION.

ART. 8.—*Self-defence: a Sermon. By the Rev. Cornelius Miles, Captain of Volunteers. 8vo. 1s. Champante and Whitrow. 1805.*

THIS is a very spirited and well-composed discourse. After a lively picture of the horrors of war, and of the sinfulness of *offensive* war, the militant preacher (if preacher he be) asserts, with equal zeal, and as much strength of reasoning, the lawfulness of *defensive* hostilities. The general argument is then applied to the situation of this country, in vindication of our resistance against the manifold aggressions and menaces of France. The volunteer system, and the law which permitted the exercise of men in arms on the Lord's-day, are next each of them vindicated by observations well worthy of regard. The sermon, after some remarks which give us a favourable opinion of the critical talents of its author, is concluded by an animated apostrophe: "Chuse ye between the two. "Let the dastard and the traitor" (I seem to hear every man present exclaim), "let the dastard and the traitor, if they will, prostrate their necks beneath the foot of the invader; but as for me and my house, we will serve our country." "

ART. 9.—*Baptismal Faith explained. A Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, April 8, 1804, by the Rev. Robert Tythwitt, M. A. of Jesus College, Cambridge. 1s. 4/6. Mawman. 1804.*

We were accustomed to hear occasionally of the name of Mr. Tythwitt, many years ago, in connection with some controversies which existed in the university of Cambridge, respecting the

doctrine of the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, subscription to the articles of religion, and some other matters. The sermon which is now before us proceeds from the pen of the same gentleman, and the perusal of it leads us back very naturally to the memory of former times, and to the circumstances which we have just now alluded to. We see nothing intrinsic in the discourse to detain us; nor can we perceive that it tells any other story, or conveys any more important information, than that the distaste which Mr. T. had formerly for many doctrines believed and revered by the greatest and best of men through eighteen revolving centuries, he still retains. To those friends who may be disposed to bend to the authority of Mr. T., and to whom it may be a confirmation and consolation of mind to know that he is still such as they formerly knew him, the publication of this sermon may be not altogether without use or relevancy; but for any other purpose it might, we think, have been full as well retained in the closet of its author. It is a very dry, meagre, illogical, and unscholar-like, dissertation upon an important subject, and can therefore do no credit to its writer or to its cause; neither need it give pain or solicitude to the catholic christian. Mr. T. connects himself with the name of Locke, and is desirous of recommending his doctrine by associating it with the *Reasonableness of Christianity* by that excellent writer. But how very few lines of resemblance are there between them! The work of Mr. Locke, though we think it is in some parts erroneous, and in others very defective; though we judge, that from not taking the whole truth, it is by no means to be received with implicit confidence; yet we would recommend the perusal of it to every scholar. Mr. T.'s discourse, were it only for its *unlikeness* to Mr. Locke, we must quit without any recommendation.

ART. 10.—*A Sermon on the Religious Advantages afforded by the Church of England to the Members of her Communion; preached at St. Mary-le-Bow, on St. Mark's Day, April 5th, 1805, in Conformity with the Will of the late Mr. John Hutchins. By the Rev. Thomas White, A. M. of Queen's College, Oxford; and Minister of Welbeck Chapel, St. Mary-le-bone. 1s. Hatchard. 1805.*

The occasion which called for the exertions of Mr. White in the present discourse is, we conceive, one of the most interesting which can employ the talents of a minister of the establishment. It is involved closely with the most important interests of the private christian, and it is connected with many considerations which must place it high in the thoughts, and home to the bosoms, of the contemplative scholar, and the philosophical patriot. For such a subject, we are impelled to cry out with the poet, 'Oh, for a muse of fire!' We are not much disposed to blame what Mr. White has said; but if we consent to withhold our censures, he must not be discontented if we stipulate also to be sparing of praise. Nothing is said very well by him, nor very ill. A ponderous, copious, and noble subject, is treated by him, without any glaring



impropriety indeed, but in a way that by no means enriches and refreshes the mind with any extraordinary supplies of eloquence, novelty, learning or wisdom.

ART. 11.—*The Plague Stayed: a scriptural View of Pestilence, particularly of that dreadful Pestilence the Small-Pox, with Considerations on the Cow-Pock: in two Sermons, one preached before the University of Cambridge, the other in the Parish Church of Hinxton, Cambridgeshire. By James Plumptre, M. A. Fellow of Clare Hall. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Rivingtons. 1805.*

The subject of these sermons is, in our humble opinion, much better fitted for the parish-church of Hinxton than for the audience to which the first of them was addressed. The information conveyed, however useful or novel to a country congregation, cannot well be supposed necessary to men of learning. We say this upon the best representation Mr. Plumptre could wish us to give; for the sermons themselves are miserably deficient in point of matter, and are made, apparently at least, for the notes, and not the notes for the sermons. Whether this mode of conveying instruction be allowable in compositions of another kind, it is now unnecessary to determine; but we must enter our decided protest against it in the present instance.

To the productions which issue immediately from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the world is accustomed to look as to an index of the state of literature amongst their resident members; and as such they regard them with peculiar attention, and blend in one common mass the loquacious and the silent, those who dare the ordeal of public criticism, and those whose works repose in the silence and security of the closet. Under this conviction, actuated also by private feelings, and not altogether forgetful of our early experience, in perusing a sermon whose title-page announces that it was preached before our own university, we always desire and expect something of more than ordinary excellence; a composition not undistinguished by the cogency of its arguments, the clearness of its deductions, and the elegance of its language. Our wishes and expectations have been disappointed in all these particulars. We transcribe the opening of the discourse: 'In a seminary of sound learning and religious education, where the study of *theology* and the investigation of science are the chief pursuits of *piety* and *learning*, the preacher,' &c. Is this 'true no-meaning?' or is it tautology? or what is it? 'Who shall decide?'

The second sermon it is not necessary to notice at large. It is very nearly a copy of the first, and is certainly more appropriate in style as well as in matter.

At parting, we would remind the author that there are two faults in his orthography, if we may so express ourselves, or rather a repetition of the same error (see page 10, line 9, and page 60, line 12). Instead of the verb he has used the substantive, which offends both against sense and grammar,

## POLITICS.

ART. 12.—*The Policy and Interest of Great Britain with respect to Malta, summarily considered.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. Hatchard. 1805.

The importance of the island of Malta, as an object of political consideration, is sufficiently demonstrated by the conspicuous figure it makes in the treaty of Amiens. The policy and interest of Great Britain with respect to it, is a question which is well entitled to a separate discussion; and the pamphlet before us, we conceive, will not disappoint the reader who wishes to have a clear and accurate view of the subject. The advantages resulting to this country from the possession of a strong and secure military and naval station in the Mediterranean, are almost too obvious to require elucidation. To protect Egypt and the Levant, and our commercial interests in general; to watch the motions, and check the hostile designs, of our enemies; to have the power of effectually co-operating with Russia in the Mediterranean, as well as in the northern seas; or, in case of Russia following a different policy, or of an attempt being made to subvert the Turkish empire, to be not merely an idle spectator, but to be powerfully present, the formidable opponent of injustice and aggression; are confessedly objects of the first political importance. The possession of Malta, in this view of the subject, is of essential consequence; to relinquish it, is to put it under the power of France, or at least under the protection of a precarious guarantee. Policy and interest, therefore, most unquestionably demand that this celebrated island should be annexed in perpetuity to the British dominions.

The author has thought proper to enter into the abstract question of right, and to enquire whether we are entitled to do this consistently with the principles of justice. Such arguments are well enough in theory, but can never weigh much in opposition to the imperious dictates of state necessity. In the present case, however, it is evident, that neither France, nor any other power on the continent, has a better right to the sovereignty of Malta than Great Britain. If any injury be done, it is to the remnant of the order of St. John. This body, indeed, can no longer be said to exist as a sovereign; but such knights as have actually sustained any losses of property, are certainly entitled to indemnification from Great Britain, in the event of Malta remaining in perpetuity in the possession of his majesty.

ART. 13.—*The Claims of the British West India Colonists to the Right of obtaining necessary Supplies from America, and of employing the necessary Means of effectually obtaining those Supplies, under a limited and duly regulated Intercourse, stated and vindicated, in Answer to Lord Sheffield's Strictures.* By G. W. Jordan, Esq. F. R. S. Colonial Agent for Barbadoes. 2s. Cadell. 1804.

Great Britain, upon general colonial principles, claims the exclusive right of import into the colonies, of colonial-export, and

of carrying all colonial imports and exports in British ships. Exceptions, however, have been admitted, in respect to some articles of the first necessity which can only be procured from America, and which of course must be paid for by the produce of the colonies: but lord Sheffield positively objects to the admission of any American vessels in carrying on this necessary intercourse with the West Indies, on the grounds that it is against the colonial principle of exclusion, that it will injure our marine, and will interfere with and diminish our direct colonial and carrying trades. Mr. Jordan, on the contrary, with much ability, replies to these objections; and maintains the necessity and propriety of admitting American vessels, under such regulations as will confine the intercourse within proper limits, essentially serve the colonies, and produce no real injury to the interests of the parent-country. To those who are more immediately interested in the question, his statement deserves every attention. As a general question, we are convinced of the impolicy of any admission which may lead to an unrestricted intercourse between America and the West Indies. That which appears to be fairly dictated by necessity, ought to be granted; but we are of opinion, that the principal defect in Mr. Jordan's argument is, that he has not been able to point out a system of regulations which would secure the object in view, without at the same time opening the door to the introduction of many abuses which hold out advantages to the planters, but which would be detrimental to the real interests of the mother country.

#### DRAMA.

ART. 14.—*Who wants a Guinea? A Comedy, in five Acts, as performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden. By George Colman, the Younger. 8va. 2s. 6d. Longman. 1805.*

Who wants a guinea? We should presume, the author of this comedy; as, otherwise, he would hardly have risked the little reputation he may have acquired in the eyes of some people, by publishing such a tissue of nothingness as the present. Whether this be the case or not, it is neither our province nor our inclination to enquire; but if it be, we enter with regret on that most unpleasant part of our duty, the condemning of the works of those who are compelled by their want of money, to make known to the world their want of genius.

The severity of critics upon modern play-writers has been objected to. But in our opinion, if there be any set of authors upon whom criticism ought to exercise her lash with the most pitiless hand, it is on those who are already amply paid for their useless labours, and who are consequently deprived of the only plea which could for a moment induce criticism to mitigate her censures.

We shall not so far trespass on the patience of our readers as to analyse this piece, or attempt to give the outlines of the plot: its vulgarity and insignificance we cannot better pourtray, than by a bare mention of the names which Mr. Colman the Younger

has assigned to his principal characters; viz. Hogmore, Solomon Gundy, Jonathan Oldskirt, sir Larry Mac Murragh, Andrew Bang, &c. The hero of this play, or at least the person from whom it receives its title (for all the characters we have mentioned are very heroic personages in this drama), is a Mr. Torrent, who indiscriminately deals out his guineas to whoever is in want of one. If there be, however, any scene better than another in this performance, it is one at the end of the third act; where Jonathan Oldskirt, a dealer in remnants, &c. at the back of St. Clement's church, is mistaken by Torrent for a modest surveyor, who had been recommended to him by his friend Heartly, as a person capable of improving his estates, and whose arrival at that time he anxiously expected. The motive which had brought this old-clothes-man into Yorkshire, was to see that a young girl, of whom he had undertaken the charge, was comfortably situated, as a house-keeper in Torrent's family, which situation he had procured her by an advertisement. This scene we shall take the liberty of quoting; both because we think it the best in the play, and at the same time that we may not be unjustly suspected of being incapable of a smile when there is any thing in a modern comedy (which is too seldom the case) that may provoke the exercise of our risible faculties. The equivoque is well conducted, and the mutual mistake is unexplained till the following act.

\* *Torr.* I'm glad the surveyor is come. We'll go at it ding-dong.

\* *Enter JONATHAN OLDSKIRT.*

Oh, pray come in! I have been expecting you, and am very happy to see you.

\* *Oldsk.* Then miss Fanny has mention'd me, (*aside.*) I should be sorry to intrude, but——

\* *Torr.* Intrude!—Nonsense. Merit never intrudes; and you have just been mention'd to me by a person I sincerely regard and respect.—Sit down.

\* *Oldsk.* Regard and respect! How pretty he talks of miss Fanny already! (*aside.*) Why, sir,——(*both of them sitting.*) The long and the short on't is, I had set my heart upon coming.

\* *Torr.* Had you heard a good account of the situation?

\* *Oldsk.* A friend, or two, told me it was a situation for any body that wanted one, to jump at.—“But,” says I, “though prospects are good, my advice is wanted, and I had better be on the spot, to see how I may mend them.”

\* *Torr.* Certainly. The only way, I suppose, to mend the prospects, is to be on the spot.

\* *Oldsk.* Well, I hope you don't think I have come upon bad grounds.

\* *Torr.* In that I must bow to your opinion. You must be a much better judge of any grounds you come upon, than I am.

\* *Oldsk.* (*aside.*) The sweetest tempered man I ever met with! —Ah, sir! we might be of much service between us:—and I

have great hopes; for, to say truth, I am prodigiously pleased with what little I have seen of your manner.

‘ *Torr.* Why, the manor, they tell me, isn’t a bad one; but there’s room for improvement.

‘ *Oldsk.* Indeed, I think it vastly agreeable.

‘ *Torr.* Then on the whole you don’t dislike the place?

‘ *Oldsk.* In my opinion, the place bids fair to turn out all I could wish.

‘ *Torr.* Well, well, we must lay our heads together, how to make it better.

‘ *Oldsk.* Begging your pardon, that will depend upon the master.

‘ *Torr.* Pooh! if you mean money, I don’t mind that.

‘ *Oldsk.* Why, money is an object, in a place, to be sure; but good treatment is a prime matter with me.

‘ *Torr.* Treatment? Aye, true;—as the poet says—“ In all let nature never be forgot :”—We must’nt have too much labour.

‘ *Oldsk.* That’s a good hearing; for she’s very delicate.

‘ *Torr.* “ But treat the goddess like a modest fair;”

‘ *Oldsk.* The goddess!

‘ *Torr.* “ Nor over-dress——”

‘ *Oldsk.* That would be ridiculous.

‘ *Torr.* ——“ Nor leave her wholly bare.”

‘ *Oldsk.* (*starting up*) Dam’me if I’d stand by and suffer such a thing, for the universe!

‘ *Torr.* (*rising*) This man’s an enthusiast in his business. He’ll do! We’ll begin our operations betimes to-morrow morning. Are you an early riser?

‘ *Oldsk.* First up in the house this thirty years.

‘ *Torr.* Indefatigable in your profession, I dare say.

‘ *Oldsk.* I was always fond of my business. When I was a boy, I had the watering-pot in my hand by day-break; and had generally done sprinkling before a soul was stirring.

‘ *Torr.* The watering-pot!—So—began with the lowest rudiments of his art, I suppose, and was a common gardener—(*aside.*) Well, application added to genius is always sure to rise—And ’tis amazing how much we have mended in your line, within the last century. Quite another taste. Hardly a remnant of the old style to be seen.

‘ *Oldsk.* Now and then a remnant of that kind comes in my way; but very scarce.

‘ *Torr.* So much the better—Our forefathers were too formal;—too stiff by half;—no grace, no ease, no sweeps;—they could never boast any thing like the lawns of the present day.

‘ *Oldsk.* Lawns are a nice article, and brought to amazing perfection, that’s certain.

‘ *Torr.* I see we shall agree in our notions on all points. We’ll talk more about it, when the cloth is removed. You’ll dine with me, of course. I have only Heartly.

‘ *Oldsk.* Dine with you? Bless me! that honour is too great.

‘ *Torr.* Why, where the deuce would you dine?



\* *Oldsk.* With your leave, as long as I stay, I'll take my victuals in the housekeeper's room.

\* *Torr. (aside)* Zounds! he is modest even to shyness, indeed, as Heartly says. You are to do as you like, but——

*Enter SOLOMON GUNDY.*

\* *Solomon.* There's a man in the hall——

\* *Torr.* Wants my *other* ear, I suppose. What's his name?

\* *Solomon.* Mr. Barford, of our village.

\* *Torr.* The gentleman I met at the Spread Eagle, who was burnt out?

\* *Solomon.* Yes;—one of the unhappy incendiaries.

\* *Torr.* Shew him into the breakfast-parlour.—And conduct this gentleman to the house-keeper's-room—(*to Oldskirt.*) But, suppose you let him take you into the park first—Do—Perhaps you'll catch a hint.

\* *Oldsk. (aside)* Catch a hint!—Bless me! I'm more likely to catch a cold, this rainy day.—By all means, whatever you please.

\* *Torr.* Attend the gentleman, then, Solomon. We shall meet by and by, you know. [Exit.]

#### NOVELS.

ART. 15.—*The Castle of Santa Fe, a Novel. By a Clergyman's Daughter; Author of Jealousy, or the Dreadful Mistake.* 4 Vols. 12mo. Lane. 1805.

We congratulate this lady upon her improvement in the capacity of a novel-writer. The Castle of Santa Fe is an interesting tale, marked with much variety of incident, and contrast of character. The heroine wins upon our favour as we proceed, and we are concerned in her happiness at the last. The moral and religious sentiments with which the work abounds, are well worthy the respectable title of their author; namely, that of a clergyman's daughter. We wish we were as secure of finding nothing contrary to strict propriety in the writings of some of her fellow-labourers, as we are in the productions of this fair author.

ART. 16.—*The Nobility of the Heart: a Novel. By Elizabeth Isabella Spencer, Author of Helen Sinclair.* 3 Vols. 12mo. Longman. 1805.

To those who read all novels, we do not scruple to recommend the present, both for the entertainment and instruction which it affords; the incidents are well conducted, and the attention sufficiently kept alive to the conclusion. There are some few typographical errors; which are to be laid to the charge of the editor, rather than to the respectable writer of these volumes, during whose absence from town they were presented to the public.

## POETRY.

ART. 17.—*The Anti-Corsican; a Poem, in three Cantos, inscribed to the Volunteers of Great Britain.* 4to. 5s. Stockdale. 1805.

This is the age for premature ability. We have infant actors and infant poets. But we are afraid that this precocity of genius too often leads to quick decay. 'Early wits have short lives,' according to Shakspeare and to Horace. Yet we hope the omen may be averted. This poem was written by a young gentleman, who had not at that time finished his education at Midhurst school, during the midsummer vacation of 1804: and it is with propriety dedicated to the Rev. J. Wool, the master of that seminary; of whom the author says, that 'his sound erudition, unremitted attention, and suavity of temper' (unlike the 'plagosus Orbilius'), 'must ever entitle him to the love and respect of his pupils.' Of the author himself we must in justice say, that he seems to be a good clever lad; and to shew that he is so, we will select a passage from his poem:

'But who, by pleasure led, can always rove  
Thro' vine-clad vallies or the spicy grove?  
Who, always sail on tranquil summer-seas,  
Gently impell'd by each refreshing breeze,  
Or always feast the never-sated eye  
On flow'ry meadows and an azure sky?  
Full oft' alas! are mortals doom'd to roam  
Thro' dreary deserts, or the midnight gloom;  
Full oft' to steer their course where whirlwinds sweep  
The lab'ring vessel o'er the foaming deep;  
Full oft' to dwell where alps on alps are hurl'd  
Like the vast wrecks of a demolish'd world.' P. 5.

As the verses of Tyrtæus gave such spirit to the Lacedæmonian troops, it might not be unadvisable for each commanding officer of our volunteer corps to purchase a copy of the above poem, and to read it at the head of his company, on muster-days, with appropriate emphasis and gesture. 'Oh! this boy lends spirit to us all!' we doubt not would be the cry of every private in the ranks. This would indeed be consecrating the talents of the poet to the service of his country.

ART. 18.—*The Odes of Anacreon, translated from the Greek into English Verse, with Notes.* By Thomas Girdlestone, M. D. Second Edition. 12mo. 4s. Crosby. 1804.

This little volume opens with a dedication to Charles Stuart, esq. and John Stuart, esq. captains in the Royal Navy, the sons of the late hon. sir Charles Stuart, knight of the bath, &c. &c. to which is subjoined an epitaph upon that gentleman, with whom the author served in the navy in a medical capacity. This epitaph is a creditable testimony of the author's gratitude. But for the translation of Anacreon little excuse can be offered: there, no motive of gratitude inspired Mr. Girdlestone's Euphrosyne; it was mere emulation of rivalling Mr. Urquhart, as he tells us in his

preface. Let this praise be his: he has rivalled, nay excelled Mr. Urquhart, as much as both are inferior in elegance to Moore; or as much as they are all inferior to their original, in every requisite quality for the composition of love and drinking songs. They all want that flow of soul, that easy careless air, Anacreon's greatest charm. Laharpe as yet is right; Anacreon never has been translated. One of the best of Dr. Girdlestone's attempts, we think, is *ode the 61st*, p. 87.

The preface contains some unimportant observations upon the composition of English verse.

ART. 19.—*Isabel, from the Spanish of Garcilasso de la Vega; with other Poems, and Translations from the Greek, Italian, &c. &c.* 8vo. 3s. 6d. Cadell. 1805.

Fidelity is the first duty of a translator. We have compared this little poem with the Spanish, and are happy to say that Mr. Walpole has not only given us a correct and faithful translation, but has always equalled, and not unfrequently surpassed, his original. But however creditable to the translator, we doubt whether too much honour has not been done to Garcilasso, and whether the present poem itself were worth translating: it contains no new ideas, nothing but what has frequently been said before, and frequently said better. Still less, in our opinion, did it deserve to give a name to a book of which it only occupies six very widely printed pages. The only objection that we have to it in its present dress, is the metre that Mr. W. has chosen; stanzas of six lines, each consisting of six syllables, the third and last excepted, which contain ten. The disproportion is so great, that the ear receives none of that pleasure which arises from the harmony of numbers, and we almost forget that we are reading verse. Mr. W., however, is sanctioned by the authority of sir W. Jones, who uses the same metre in a translation from Petrarch, beginning:

‘Ye clear and sparkling streams,  
Warm’d by the sunny beams, &c.’

In one case our author has, at all events, been injudicious, in extending the last line to the exorbitant length of twelve syllables:

‘Thy face to turn aside,  
The gushing tears to hide,

Which mourn’d for her whom death had claim’d a timeless prey.’

Of the miscellaneous translations the greatest part have already appeared in print, and have received from us the commendations they so highly deserved. Of the new ones, the same may be said as of *Isabel*; that they contain nothing novel, but shew great taste and power of language on the part of the translator. One of the best of them is from the French of Parny, the profligate author of the ‘*War of the Gods*.’ It is, however, a close imitation of the ode of Horace beginning ‘*Altera jam teritur*,’ &c. with this difference: the Roman poet recommends to his countrymen to fly to the Fortunate Islands to avoid the corruption and discord which prevailed at Rome; the Frenchman, with greater gallantry, proposes to his mistress to seek a similar retirement, that they may pursue without restraint the pleasurable occupations of love,

We shall select a few stanzas, which will serve at the same time as no unfavourable specimen of Mr. Walpole's poetical talents;

‘ Not far, there lies an isle, whose beetling coast  
 Old Ocean circles with his billowy arms ;  
 There breathe all sweets the circling year can boast ;  
 There Flora smiles, array'd in all her charms.  
 ‘ O'er the gay meads the murmuring rivulet flows,  
 Where flaunting roses with ananas bloom ;  
 With balmy airs the sky attempter'd glows,  
 And whispering zephyrs waft their soft perfume.  
 ‘ Say—darts thine eye its liquid glance of fire?—  
 Heaves thy warm bosom to the sighs of love?—  
 Glows o'er thy cheek the blush of young desire?—  
 In vain!—for age and wisdom *here* reprove.  
 ‘ But *there*, with pleasure crown'd, and wing'd with joy,  
 The dancing hours their rapid flight shall roll ;  
 Gay dreams of future bliss our thoughts employ,  
 And bathe in deep delight th' entranced soul.’  
 Upon the whole, this is an elegant and pleasing little volume.

#### MEDICINE.

ART. 20.—*The Anatomy of the Human Body, Vol. III. containing the Nervous System. By Charles Bell, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. 8vo. 15s. Longman and Co. 1804.*

As this interesting volume is the continuation of a work which is well known to the public, we shall content ourselves with a brief notice of it. It is divided into two parts; the first including the anatomy of the brain and nerves; the second, that of the skin and the organs of sense. The dryness of mere anatomical detail, as in the former volumes, is relieved by the introduction of physiological, and occasionally of pathological, discussion; and facts of importance are illustrated by comparative views of the organs and functions of various animals. On the subjects of the eye and the ear particularly, including the philosophy of vision and of sound, the author has collected an ample store of useful and curious information. The use which he has assigned to the *membrana pupillaris*, hitherto not clearly understood, is sufficiently probable. It serves, he observes, to connect and stretch the iris to the middle degree of contraction, which, in the darkness of the fœtal state, would otherwise be completely dilated; and thus it conduces to the proper nourishment and extension of that delicate part of the organ. P. 308. His observations on squinting, and the modifications of vision, are interesting. On the whole, Mr. Bell has given a distinct and correct view of the general state of modern science relative to the subjects in question; and if he has not displayed so much of that singular talent of rendering anatomical descriptions amusing, as characterises the former volumes, executed by his brother, he has shewn none of that sarcastic spirit, and *Shandean* affectation of odd and uncommon reading, which are among the less honourable distinctions of the writings of the latter.

This volume contains ten plates, besides a considerable number of vignettes.

## MISCELLANIES.

**ART. 21.**—*A System of English Grammar, upon a Plan entirely new. Intended as a Means of facilitating the Progress both of public and private Education. By J. Taylor, Head Master of the Academy, Dronfield, near Chesterfield. 12mo. Hurst. 1804.*

A knowledge of our own language, which till lately was much neglected, is indisputably an object of the first importance in the education of youth; but whether this is likely to be obtained by the many novel publications which are daily advertised on the subject of English grammar, is a point which will admit dispute; or rather we think we may with safety affirm, that they tend to confound what they profess to facilitate. After the Grammar of Mr. Murray had made its appearance, we flattered ourselves that no one would venture to obtrude any other system upon us. Nor dowe say this from the idea that Mr. Taylor has performed his task amiss. On the contrary, we entertain a very favourable opinion of his work: but we hoped and sincerely wished we might never see another school grammar on this subject; because experience has convinced us, that where so many schemes are adopted, none can be learnt with accuracy; nor are boys in general ever capable of understanding the combination of words in English grammar, without a previous knowledge of the ancient languages. They may be taught the parts of speech, as they are called; they may learn to distinguish a noun from an adjective, or a verb from a pronoun; but they seldom are able to parse, or comprehend how one word depends upon another, without a previous acquaintance with the rudiments of the Latin at least. We are aware that in asserting this we differ from the opinion of our author; who, in a note at page 19, intimates that boys should first be taught the English grammar: but our opinion is not singular. Without entering farther on the subject, we shall just point out the *principal novelty* in this treatise: observing by the way, that the contents give the lie to the title; for the remainder of the work is so far from being on a plan *entirely new*, that the same method is pursued in a hundred publications of this kind.—The first novelty is in the declensions of nouns, which are by Mr. Taylor accounted six in number:

The first includes all nouns that assume the letter s only to terminate their plurals; as, sing. boy, plur. boys:

The second declension includes all nouns that assume es to terminate their plurals; as wretch, plur. wretches; grotto, plur. grottoes:

The third declension includes those nouns that terminate the nominative case singular with fe, or a single f; as wolf, wife, &c.:

The fourth declension includes all nouns that terminate the nominative case singular with the letter y, preceded by a consonant; as enemy, plur. enemies:

The fifth includes all nouns that terminate with en in the plural, as man, men; ox, oxen:

The sixth includes those nouns that terminate the singular number with ce, se, t, or th; as mouse, mice; goose, geese; foot, feet; tooth, teeth.



We do not think any thing gained by this arrangement, which perhaps is more ingenious than useful : but are of opinion that the mode adopted by Lowth, Harrison, &c. of one declension, is preferable ; because, after the first declension, no rule is given for the formation of plurals, and the learner is supposed to know the plural number before he can determine to what declension the singular belongs ; yet with all the advantages of six modes of declining nouns, Mr. Taylor is obliged at last to have recourse to exceptions.—The next novelty which occurs, is in the assumption of four conjugations ; which, however, reduce him to the same necessity of adopting as many exceptions as if he had been content with one :

The first conjugation comprises all verbs that end with the vowel *e* ; as to state, to write, &c. :

The second conjugation includes all verbs not denoted in the fourth, that end with a consonant, with *y* preceded by a vowel, or with the letter *w* ; as to insult, to annoy, to crow. :

The third conjugation includes all verbs that end with *y* preceded by a consonant ; as to deny, to fly, &c. :

The fourth conjugation includes all verbs that end with *ch*, *sh*, *x*, *ss*, or the vowel *o* ; as to teach, to banish, to fix, to oppress, to echo.

These are the principal novelties in this publication. For this latter arrangement Mr. T. deserves our approbation ; it is both useful and ingenious. The merit, indeed, of the whole performance, is such as to entitle the author to no inconsiderable rank among the writers on English grammar ; and we hope and trust that his labour will not be fruitless.

ART. 22.—*The Works of Diogenes. Vol. I. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Egerton. 1804.*

From the singularity of style and manner adopted by this anonymous author, it is manifest that he has had constantly in view the notes to the Pursuits of Literature ; for which we cannot praise him, and are sorry to add that he is much inferior even to that exceptionable model. He would have done better not to compose his satire in the form of a play : which, as a play, is certainly entitled to no degree of commendation, being a mere vehicle for the conveyance of his sentiments on "Every-day Characters," the title which he has given to his comedy. Prefixed to the play is an address to his countrymen, which however gives evident indication that Diogenes possesses talents of a superior nature to the generality of the scribblers of the day ; yet he is guilty of a fault but too common with many modern play-wrights, who mistake bombast for sublimity, and overcharge their pages with a load of pompous but useless epithets. He almost rivals Rosa Matilda, who has of late dealt her rhapsodical effusions in the morning prints with a most liberal hand. The address however is on the whole well-written, and abounds in apposite quotations, in which the author of the Pursuits of Literature was singularly happy. On the modern dramatists he is justly severe ; to the reviewers not illi-

beral; and to the gods of the theatre, to whom he has addressed a prologue, deservedly inimical. To the brainless authors who so frequently inveigh against critics in their prefaces, introductions, &c. he says, 'When a man once prints his sentiments, they are no longer his own, and every person has a right to comment upon them at his leisure.' He prudently determines therefore to acquiesce in the opinions of his reviewers, be they ever so severe; and hopes that the consciousness of having written only in the cause of virtue and of his country, will mollify the severity of criticism.

The author seems to be a real patriot; and a decisive enemy to all those political scribblers whose only aim is profit, and who undertake to arraign the conduct of whoever happens to be minister. We cannot forbear hinting that the modern Diogenes seems not to possess that contempt of riches, which was a peculiar feature in the character of his namesake of Sinope.

ART. 23.—*Roscius in London. Biographical Memoirs of William Henry West Betty, from the earliest Period of his Infancy. Including the History of his Irish, Scotch, and English Engagements: with Analytical Strictures on his Acting at the London Theatres.* 8vo. 2s. Crosby. 1805.

The former part of this pamphlet consists of extracts from Mr. Jackson's and other publications on the same subject; the latter is purloined from Merritt's account of this theatrical hero, which we have before noticed, and from the daily papers.

---

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. MALCOLM and Mr. Britton may depend upon their works being noticed as soon as possible.

We are much obliged by Mr. Butler's good wishes, and shall pay immediate attention to his sermon.

We are sorry it has not been in our power to review Mr. Taylor's publication sooner.

---

#### ERRATA in our last Number.

P. 88, last line, for rotation read notation.—P. 90, line 13, instead of there is another kind of faith to truths of religion, read the following extract, which was omitted by a mistake of the printer: 'There is another kind of faith or assent more sedate and elaborate in kind, which must be distinguished from this, which I call credulity. Credulity is instinctive and instantaneous, the other kind of faith technical and progressive. Credulity seems to be the child of feeling, the other species the work of intellect. Credulity occurs every day, every hour; it attends the most common propositions; it takes place in the most ordinary occurrences of life. The other kind of faith appears in the gradual yielding, and chastised assent of the mind, to preponderating evidence, whether we decide on controverted points of history, and contested facts in juridical proceedings, or yield to the conviction that accompanies the truths of religion. p. 57.'

---

N. B. The Appendix to the fourth volume of the third Series was published on the 1st of last month.